

12 a 6

THE
WORKS
OF
NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

IN ELEVEN VOLUMES:

CONTAINING THE
CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;
JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES;
HISTORY OF HERETICS;
AND HIS SERMONS AND TRACTS;

WITH
GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, AND COPIOUS INDEXES.

TO THE FIRST VOLUME IS PREFIXED
THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,
BY
ANDREW KIPPIS, D.D. F.R.S. AND S.A.

VOLUME III.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. JOHNSON, N^o 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.
M,DCC,LXXXVIII.



CH
XL

XL

XL
XL
XL
XL

XL
XL

XL
XL
L.
LI.

LII
LII
LIV
LV

LV
LV

C O N T E N T S

OF THE

T H I R D V O L U M E.

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY,

PART II. VOL. IV. V. VI.

CHAP.		A. D.	PAGE.
XL.	DIVERS WRITERS IN THE FORMER PART OF THE THIRD CENTURY - - - - -	...	I
XLI.	NOETUS, AND OTHERS, CALLED HERETICS, IN THE FORMER PART OF THE THIRD CENTURY, OR SOON AFTER - - - - -	...	7
XLII.	GREGORY, BISHOP OF NEOCÆSAREA - - - - -	243	25
XLIII.	DIONYSIUS, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA - - - - -	247	57
XLIV.	CYPRIAN, BISHOP OF CARTHAGE - - - - -	248	133
XLV.	WRITINGS ASCRIBED TO CYPRIAN, OR JOINED WITH HIS WORKS - - - - -	...	183
XLVI.	ST. CORNELIUS AND ST. LUCIUS, BISHOPS OF ROME	251	203
XLVII.	NOVATUS, OTHERWISE CALLED NOVATIAN - - - - -	251	206
	A NOTE UPON CHAP. XLVII. - - - - -	...	248
XLVIII.	DIONYSIUS, BISHOP OF ROME - - - - -	259	253
XLIX.	COMMODIAN - - - - -	270	257
L.	MALCHION, PRESBYTER OF ANTIOCH - - - - -	270	261
LI.	ANATOLIUS, AND THREE OTHERS, BISHOPS OF LAODICEA - - - - -	270	265
LII.	THEOGNOSTUS - - - - -	282	273
LIII.	THEONAS, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA - - - - -	282	277
LIV.	PIERIUS, PRESBYTER OF ALEXANDRIA - - - - -	283	279
LV.	1. DOROTHEUS, PRESBYTER OF ANTIOCH - - - - -	290	283
	2. DOROTHEUS, AUTHOR OF THE SYNOPSIS, ETC. - - - - -	...	284
LVI.	VICTORINUS, BISHOP OF PETTAW - - - - -	290	286
LVII.	METHODIUS, BISHOP OF OLYMPUS IN LYCIA - - - - -	290	303

VOL. III.

CHAP.		A. D.	PAGE.
LVIII.	LUCIAN, PRESBYTER OF ANTIOCH, AND HESYCHIUS, BISHOP IN ÆGYPT - - - - -	290	322
LIX.	PAMPHILUS, PRESBYTER OF CÆSAREA - - - - -	294	335
LX.	PHILEAS, BISHOP OF THMUIS, IN ÆGYPT; AND PHI- LOROMUS, RECEIVER GENERAL AT ALEXANDRIA	296	351
LXI.	PETER, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, AND THE MELE- TIANS - - - - -	300	354
	AN ANSWER TO MR. JACKSON'S REMARKS - - -	...	360
LXII.	ARCHELAUS, BISHOP IN MESOPOTAMIA - - -	...	368
LXIII.	MANI AND HIS FOLLOWERS		
SECT. I.	A GENERAL HISTORY OF THE MANICHEES - - -	...	374
II.	THE HISTORY OF MANI - - - - -	...	415
III.	MANI'S PREDECESSORS AND WORKS - - -	...	428
IV.	THE SENTIMENTS OF THE MANICHEES CON- CERNING DIVERS POINTS - - - - -	...	437
V.	THEIR WORSHIP - - - - -	...	489
VI.	THE MANICHÆAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE SCRIPTURES - - - - -	...	493
VII.	VARIOUS READINGS AND SELECT PASSAGES IN FAUSTUS THE MANICHEE - - - - -	...	537
VIII.	THE CONCLUSION OF THE HISTORY OF THE MANICHEES - - - - -	...	539
IX.	THE PAULICIANS - - - - -	...	545
	REMARKS UPON MR. BOWER'S ACCOUNT OF THE MANICHEES - - - - -	...	549

E R R A T A.

Page. line.	Title, for 264	read.	P.	read.
79	Title, for 264	247	110 (z)	Vol. ii. p. 378.
138, 140, 142, 144, in titles,	Ch. XLIV.		— (A)	Vol. ii. p. 412.
224 1	—	Marcian	172 col. 1. l. 4.	judicanti
239 1	after called, insert	ε	208 l. 2.	ανιστραφθας
330 2	—	Huet	216 col. 2. l. 13.	crimina
378 5	—	presumption	218 col. 2. antepen.	μυστηριων
384 10	—	Heracleon	256 col. 2. l. 4.	λεγομενων
421 11	—	Sapor.	280 col. 2. penult.	κηρυσσει.
IN THE NOTES.				
14 note c, for p. 200	450.		307 col. 2. l. 5.	παράδειλματας
28 col. 2. penult.	—	ετος	373 col. 1. l. 2.	immensam
30 col. 1. l. 1.	—	Οτω	388 col. 1. l. 1.	Lucam
76 col. 2. l. 5.	—	πεισιν	425 col. 1. l. 14.	συντατυχηκotes
80 col. 1. l. 3.	—	και εβην	462 col. 1. l. 4.	ejusdem splendidissima
108 n. γ, for Vol. iii. p.	See Vol. ii. p.		464 col. 2. l. 11.	origo.

[381, 385, 519.]

THE
CREDIBILITY
OF THE
GOSPEL HISTORY,
PART II.

[VOL. IV. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCL.]

CHAP XL.

DIVERS writers in the former part of the third century.

I. *Judas*. II. *Anonymous Author of the Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas*. III. *Proculus*. IV. *Geminianus*. V. *Tryphon*.

I. 'AT that time,' says ^a Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, 'lived also Judas, another writer, who published a Commentary upon Daniel's Seventy Weeks, concluding his computation of the times at the tenth year of Severus; who likewise thought, that the so much talked of coming of Antichrist was then at hand. So strangely did the raising of that persecution disturb the minds of many.'

St. Jerom, likewise, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, has a chapter for this person. But he mentions no other work of his beside this. He says, that ^b Judas commented largely upon Daniel's Seventy Weeks, and brought down his Chronology of former times to the tenth year of Severus. This writer is placed by Cave at the year of Christ 202, where his Chronology ended. It is probable, this Commentary would afford many testimonies to the New Testament, if it were still extant. It might be useful also on other accounts.

II. In that persecution suffered in Africa, at Tuburbium, as ^c some have thought, or, as ^d others more probably, at

^a Euseb. L. vi. cap. 7.

^b Judas de septuaginta apud Danieli hebdomadibus plenissime disputavit, et chronographiam superiorum temporum usque ad decimum Severi produxit annum. De Vir. Ill. cap. 52.

^c Vid. Ruinart. Act. Mart. Admonit.

in Passionem S. S. Perpetuæ, &c. § 2. p. 90.

^d Ruinart. ib. et. § 3. Basnag. Ann. 203. n. iv. Tillemont Mem. Ecc. tom. 3. part. i. p. 233. Sainte Perpetue, &c. Art. i. et Note iv. p. 303. Page 198.

n. v. et 203. n. v.

Carthage, Perpetua, Felicitas, Revocatus, Saturninus, Saturus, and Secundulus. The year is not certain. Ruinart^e thinks their martyrdom happened in 202 or 203; Basnage,^f in 203; Tillemont,^g in 203 or 205.

Perpetua is celebrated^h by Tertullian as a martyr who suffered with great firmness. St. Augustine publishedⁱ three discourses pronounced by him on the anniversary of those martyrs, which are still extant^k among his sermons. The day was called by the names of Perpetua and Felicitas, such fortitude being esteemed, as^l he says, more admirable in the weaker sex than the other.

St. Augustine^m has also in other places made mention of Perpetua and her passion. We still have such a piece, entitledⁿ *The Passion of the Saints Perpetua and Felicitas, with their Companions*. Basnage^o allows it to be ancient; and^p Tillemont says it is one of the finest monuments of antiquity. Indeed, the story is affecting, and the piece is curious in divers respects: but I must not stay to transcribe particulars; it may suffice to say, that Secundulus^q died in prison; Saturninus, Revocatus, Saturus, and the two women, according to^r the sentence pronounced by the judge, were exposed to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre, on^t the birth-day of Antoninus Geta, Cæsar, and son of the emperor Severus, supposed to be the seventh day of March. Vivian Perpetua^u was about two and twenty years of age, of a good family, well educated, honourably married, had a father and mother and two brothers then living, and a young child not yet weaned from her breasts, at the time of her imprisonment: and, as it seems, the^w whole family was Christian, except her father,

^e Ib. n. 4. p. 91. ^f Basn. ibid.

^g Tillam. ib. et Note iii.

^h Quomodo Perpetua fortissima martyr sub die passionis in revelatione paradisi solos illic commartyres suos vidit. Tertull. de Anima, cap. 55. p. 353, D.

ⁱ De natali Perpetuæ et Felicitatis, tractatus tres. Possid. Ind. Opusc. S. Aug.

^k Serm. 280, 281, 282.

^l Refulget et præminet inter comites martyres et meritum et nomen Perpetuæ et Felicitatis, sanctarum Dei famularum. Nam ibi est corona gloriosior, ubi sexus infirmior. Aug. Serm. 281. in.

^m Quam multos parentes filii prohibebant mori, sicut novimus et legimus in passione beatæ Perpetuæ. August. in

Pf. 47. p. 423. B. T. iv. Bened. Vid. eund. de Anima. l. 1. cap. 10. l. 3, cap. 9. l. iv. cap. 18. tom. x. Bened.

ⁿ Ap. Act. Mart. p. 92, &c.

^o Basn. ib. n. viii.

^p As before, Art. i. p. 232.

^q Pass. Perpet. &c. num. xiv. p. 99. Act. Mart. Ruinart.

^r Ibid. n. vi. p. 95.

^s N. xix. et seqq. p. 100, 101.

^t Munere enim castrensi eramus pugnaturi. Natale tunc Getæ Cæsaris, ibid. n. vii. p. 96.

^u N. ii. p. 93.

^w Et ego dolebam canos patris mei, quod solus de passione mea gavisurus non esset de toto genere meo. Ib. n. v. p. 95.

who did his utmost to persuade his daughter to save her life by renouncing her religion.

The author of this history is called Anonymous by * Cave. Some have † guessed that Tertullian might be the writer of it. But though that opinion be for the present given up, there is a dispute subsisting among learned men about the character of the writer, whether he was a Montanist or a Catholic. Indeed, the composer of this piece is now generally called not an author, but ‡ a collector; for † Perpetua here relates her own history herself, with the visions she had in prison, till ‡ the very day before her passion. Here is besides a † vision of Saturus, said likewise to be written by himself. Tillemont therefore says, ‘ That † the principal and best part of this piece was written by Perpetua herself on the eve of her martyrdom. There is also a vision written by Saturus himself. The † rest is the work of a contemporary author, as appears from the preface; where he professes to write what he knew, appealing to those who were present at the martyrdom.’ So Tillemont, and to the like purpose others. Nevertheless, I do not perceive Augustine to † allow that Perpetua wrote any part of her passion. However, whether author or collector of these Acts, † Basnage, after † Henry Valesius, contends stiffly that he was a Montanist. And from the character of the writer of the Acts he farther argues, that † Perpetua, and the rest who suffered martyrdom with her, were all of the same sect. On the contrary, Ruinart † is persuaded the writer was a catholic. And † Dodwell has argued strongly on the same side of the question.

In this piece there are not many texts of scripture. However, we shall observe a few particulars.

1. Here are words of † John xvi. 24.

* Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 64.

† Vid. Ruinart, ib. p. 91. n. 5.

‡ Inquirendum tandem, quisnam fuerit horum actorum auctor, seu potius collector, cum eorum maximam partem a Perpetua et Saturus scriptam fuisse nemo inficiari possit. Ruinart, ib. Conf. Basnag. 203. n. vi.

† Hæc ordinem totum martyrii sui jam hinc ipsa narrabit, sicut conscriptum manu sua, et suo sensu reliquit. Ap. Ruinart. ib. p. 93. n. ii.

‡ Hoc usque in pridie muneris egi: ipsius autem muneris actum, si quis voluerit, scribat. Ib. p. 98. n. x:

† Sed et Saturus benedictus hanc vi-

sionem suam edidit, quam ipse conscripsit. Ib. p. 98. n. xi.

† Tillem. as before. p. 231.

‡ De fratre autem Sanctæ Perpetuæ Dinocrate, nec scriptura ipsa canonica est, nec illa sic scripsit, vel quicumque illud scripsit, &c. Aug. de Anima. lib. i. cap. x.

† Basn. Ann. 203. n. v.

‡ Vid. Ruinart. Act. M. p. 91. n. 6.

† Basn. ib. n. vi. † Ruinart. ib.

‡ Diff. Cypr. iv. n. 12. 13.

† Sed qui dixerat, Petite et Accipite, petentibus dedit eum exitum, quem quisque desideraverat. ap. Ruin. p. 100. n. xix.

4 *Credibility of the Gospel History.* Part II. Ch. XL. vol. 4. p. 429.

2. The passage of Joel ii. 28, is ^m here at length, the same that is cited by St. Peter, Acts ii. 17. But I do not observe any proof of its being taken out of the book of the Acts.

3. If I mistake not, there is an allusion, ⁿ or reference to 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

4. The writer in the preface alludes to ^o the beginning of St. John's first epistle, and adopts some of the words of it; see 1 John i. 1, 2, 3.

III. Proculus has been already (A) taken notice of, as mentioned by Tertullian, together with divers other ecclesiastical writers; and on account (B) of the dialogue or conference of Caius upon the point of Montanism, I think it proper to take some farther notice of him in this place.

It is undoubted, that the person with whom Caius disputed was then a Montanist. He is expressly called by Eusebius ^p a leader or patron of the Cataphrygian sect, and a follower of Montanus by ^q Jerom and ^r Photius. According to the author of the Catalogue of Heretics at the end of Tertullian's book of Prescription against Heretics, who is supposed by Dodwell ^s and ^t Pagi to have been contemporary with Tertullian, and by ^u Tillemont, to have written about the year 200, there were ^w two parties of the Montanists; the one called after Proclus or Proculus, the other after Æschines: and the former are reckoned to ^x have been more orthodox than the latter in the doctrine of the trinity.

It is certain, therefore, that there was one Proculus, a Montanist, at the beginning of the third century, with whom Caius disputed. But whether he be the same whom Tertullian mentions and highly commends, together with several ancient ecclesiastical writers, admits a question. Valesius ^y thinks they

^m Ibid. p. 93. n. i.

ⁿ Cum semper Deus operetur quæ repromisit, non credentibus in testimonium, credentibus in beneficium, ibid.

^o Et nos itaque quod audivimus et contractavimus annuntiamus et vobis, fratres et filioli, ut et vos qui interfuitis, rememoremur gloriæ Domini: et qui nunc cognoscitis per auditum, communionem habeatis cum sanctis martyribus, et per illos cum Domino Jesu Christo. ibid.

(A) See Ch. xxvii. numb. 1.

(B) See Ch. xxxii. numb. i.

^p Προκλῶ της κατα Φρυγας προσηταμενω γνωμης. H. E. l. 2. c. 25, p. 67. D. προς προκλον της κατα Φρυγας αιρεσιως υπερχεμενω, id. l. 6, cap. 20.

^q Adversum Proculum, Montani Sectatorem. De V. I. cap. 59.

^r Κατα προκλῶ δι σπινδαζου μοντανου, Cod. 48, p. 37. in.

^s Diss. Sing. p. 216. ap. Pearson. Op. Post.

^t Crit. 171, numb. iv.

^u Tertull. Art. iv. p. 344, et note vii.

^w Accesserunt alii hæretici, qui dicuntur secundam Phrygas. Sed horum non una doctrina est. Sunt enim qui Kata Proclum dicuntur, sunt qui secundum Æschinem pronuntiantur. ap. Tertull. de Præscr. Hær. cap. 52, p. 254. c.

^x See Caius. in Tillem. Mem. T. 3, P. i. p. 295.

^y Ann. in Euf. l. iv. cap. 20, p. 123.

were two different persons; the former an Asiatic, the latter an African. But, by Cave, ² his arguments are reckoned of no great weight: and Tillemont ³ allows it to be very probable that one and the same person is intended, and thinks that he whom Tertullian speaks of may have been the means of drawing him into the Montanist scheme.

That Proculus is commended by Tertullian ^b as an excellent example of chastity and Christian eloquence. He wrote against the Valentinians; and for that reason is joined by him with Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and other the most eminent writers of the church. But the work itself is not in being; nor doth there remain any other account of it, that I remember.

I have all along supposed, that Proclus and Proculus are one name, only written differently; the former chiefly used by the Greeks, the other by the Latins; for, in speaking of the same affair, Caius's antagonist is called Proclus by Eusebius and Photius, Proculus by Jerom.

About this time there were several of this name; as Proculus Torpacion, a Christian, mentioned by ^c Tertullian, as well known to the emperor Severus, of whom we may have occasion to say more at some other season.

There was likewise a proconsul of Asia, named ^d Proclus Quintilianus, who pronounced sentence against Pionius: but when that excellent martyr suffered, whether in the time of Marcus Antoninus, or of Decius, is a point much contested ^e by learned men; though Eusebius has expressly mentioned his martyrdom in his ^f Ecclesiastical History.

Beside these, there is one Proclus, a bishop, who joins with five other bishops in a letter ^g to Paul of Samosata, supposed to have been written some time between 264 and 270.

² Hist. Lit. p. 65.

³ Tillem. as before. See him likewise in Tertullien Art. viii. p. 363, 364, et note xv. p. 552.

^b . . . quas tot jam viri sanctitate et præstantia insignes, nec solum nostri antecessores, sed ipsorum hæresiarcharum contemporales, instructissimis voluminibus et prodiderunt et retulerunt: ut Justinus philosophus et Martyr, ut Miltiades. . . ut Irenæus. . . ut Proculus noster, virginis senectæ, et Christianæ eloquentiæ dignitas: quos in omni opere fidei, quemadmodum in isto, optaverim assequi. Test. adv. Valent.

^c Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini, Christianorum memor fuit. Nam et

Proculum Christianum, qui Torpacion cognominabatur, Euhodiæ procuratorem, qui eum per oleum aliquando curaverat, requisivit, et in palatio suo habuit usque ad mortem.

^d Επὶ προκλῆς κυριλλῆως ἀντιπατὸς τῆς ἀσίας. Chr. Pasch. p. 270. D. Conf. Act. Mart. Ruinart. p. 138, 149, 151, et Tillemont note v. Sur S. Pione. p. 450.

^e Vid. Ruinart. ib. p. 137, et seqq. Basnag. Ann. 269, n. 21, et seq. 250, n. 7, 8, et Saint Pione, p. 230, et note ii. p. 445, dans Tillemont Mem. Ec. T. iii. P. ii.

^f Lib. 4. cap. 15, p. 135. C. D.

^g Ap. Labb. Concil. T. i. p. 344, &c.

But the genuineness^h of that letter has been called in question.

I need not here take notice of any more of this name, who lived a good while before, or after this time; and therefore are in little danger of being confounded with our Proculus, or any of the other just mentioned.

IV. 'Geminus,' saysⁱ Jerom, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, 'presbyter of the church of Antioch, composed a few monuments of his wit, flourishing under the emperor Alexander, and Zebennus, bishop of his city, chiefly about the time that Heraclas was ordained bishop of the church of Alexandria.'

In his Chronicle, Eusebius, or rather Jerom, at the sixth of the emperor Alexander, of Christ 227, writes—'Geminianus,^k presbyter of Antioch; and Hippolytus, and Beryllus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, are esteemed famous writers.'

Here is a small difference; for in the Catalogue Jerom says, Geminus or Geminianus flourished in the time of Zebennus; whereas in the Chronicle he puts him a year before Zebennus was bishop of Antioch, whose ordination is there placed at the seventh year of Alexander. Tillemont^l reconciles this difference thus: that Geminianus appeared in the world at the year 227, but was more especially famous about the year 231 or 232, when Heraclas was bishop of Alexandria. I think, that in the Chronicle, where Jerom was pleased to name several persons together, and put them at one and the same year, it is not to be expected that the time should suit them all alike; and he was at liberty to mention their time more exactly in his Catalogue, if he thought fit, and had room. This writer is placed by Cave at the year 232.

I have formerly mentioned (c) the succession of the bishops in the church of Antioch from the time of the apostles to Serapion, the eighth bishop of that church. Asclepiades the ninth succeeded him in 211. The tenth was^m Philetus, ordained about 220. The eleventhⁿ Zebennus, or Zebinus, in

^h Vid. Basnag. Ann. 264, n. vi. vii.

ⁱ Geminus Antiochenæ ecclesiæ presbyter, pauca ingenii sui monumenta composuit, florens sub Alexandro principe, et episcopo urbis suæ Zebenno eo vel maxime tempore, quo Heraclas Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ pontifex ordinatus est. De Vir. Ill. cap. 64.

^k Geminianus presbyter Antioche-

nus, et Hippolytus, et Beryllus, episcopus Arabiæ Bostrenus, clari scriptores habentur. Chron. p. 173.

^l See Saint Urbain. Tillem. Mem. Ecl. t. 3, P. ii. p. 46.

(c) See Ch. 20. and Ch. 26.

^m Euf. H. E. l. vi. c. 21, p. 223. C.

ⁿ Id. ibid. cap. 23, p. 224. C. Conf. Euseb. Chr. p. 172, 173.

228. The twelfth ° Babylas, who had the honour to die a martyr for Christ in the Decian persecution, in the year^p 249 or^q 250: the year of his ordination is not certain; it is supposed by some^r to have been 237 or 238. He was succeeded^s by Fabius, who died^t in the beginning of the year 252. His successor was^u Demetrian; whom Paul of Samosata succeeded in^w 260.

V. 'Tryphon,' says^x Jerom in his Catalogue, 'a disciple of Origen, to whom several of his letters, still extant, were written, was very skilful in the scriptures; as his many pieces every where shew, but especially that book which he published about the red heifer in Deuteronomy, [It should be Numbers; see Chap. xix.] and the half pieces of the living creatures laid by Abraham's pigeon and turtle-dove in Genesis.' See Gen. xv. 9, 10, 11. This learned man is placed by Cave at the year 233. His works are not extant.

C H A P. XLI.

NOETUS, and others, called heretics, in the former part of the third century, or soon after.

I. Noetus. II. Valesians. III. Angelics. IV. Apostolics. V. Origenists.

I. BASNAGE^a supposeth that Noetus arose about the year 240. Fabricius^b about 245. And, indeed, as Epiphanius composed his work against heresies in 375 or 376, and he there says that^c Noetus lived about 130 years before that time, we are carried up to the year 245: but Epiphanius

^o ib. cap. 29.

^p Vid. Basnag. Ann. 239, numb. iii.

^q See Saint Babylas in Tillem. tom.

3, P. ii. p. 192.

^r Vid. Basn. ib. n. i. et Tillem. ib.

p. 288, et note i. et ii. sur Saint Babylas.

^s Παραπλησιως εν αντιοχεια τη βαβυλα μετα την ομολογια εν δισμωτηριω μεταλλαξαντος, Φαβιος της αυτοθι προισταις εκκλησιας. Euf. l. vi. cap. 39.

^t Vid. Pagi 252, num. vi. Tillemont

St. Dénys d'Alex. Sect. vii. Mem. t.

iv. P. ii. p. 563, 564.

^u Vid. Euseb. l. vi. cap. 46, p. 248,

A. et lib. vii. cap. 14.

^w Vid Pagi. 261, n. vi.

^x Tryphon Origenis auditor, ad quem nonnullæ ejus extant epistolæ, in scripturis eruditissimus fuit. Quod quidem et multa ejus sparsim ostendunt opuscula, sed præcipue liber, quem composuit de vacca rufa in Deuteronomio, et de dichomematibus, quæ cum columba et turture Abraham ponuntur in Genesi. De V. I. cap. 57.

^a Vid. Basnag. Ann. 256, n. 14.

^b Vid. Philastr. de Hær. 53, not. ^a p. 105, Ed. Fabr.

^c ἀλλ' ὡς προ χρόνῳ τῶν τῆτιν ἑκατὸν τριακοντα, πλεον η ἑλασσον. Epiph. H. 57, p. 479. C.

does not pretend to be exact; and since we have supposed Hippolytus, who wrote against the Noetians, to have flourished about the year 220, we cannot place Noetus much later. Beaufobre^d has argued after a like manner. He says, that Noetus must have published his notion sooner than is intimated by Epiphanius; because Hippolytus, who flourished about the year 222, speaks of Noetus as dead some time before he wrote against him. However, this argument of that learned man depends in part upon the supposition that the work ascribed to Hippolytus is genuine. Huet^e observes, that Noetus was contemporary with Origen, which I presume will not be denied by any.

The piece referred to by Beaufobre, sometimes called a homily against Noetus, by others supposed to be the concluding article of Hippolytus's work against heresies, begins in this manner: 'Others^f there are who advance another opinion, 'being disciples of one Noetus, of Smyrna, who lived not 'long ago. He, elated with pride, said that Christ was the 'Father himself, and that the Father was begotten, and suffered and died. He likewise said, that he himself was Moses, and his brother Aaron. When the blessed presbyters 'had heard of these things, they called him before the church, 'and examined him. At first he denied that he held such a 'doctrine; but at length, after having concealed himself for 'a while, when he had got some few to be of the same erroneous opinion with him, he became more ready to defend it 'publicly. The blessed presbyters then called him before them 'again; when he said, "What^g harm do I do in honouring "Christ?" To whom the presbyters answered, "We also know "there is one God, we own Christ, and know that the Son "suffered, died, and rose again the third day, and is at the "right-hand of the Father, and will come to judge the quick "and the dead." Thus, having convicted him, they cast him 'out of the church.' This writer adds soon after, that^h Noetus argued in this manner: 'The scriptures declare one God, 'even the Father. This being manifest, and it being acknowledged that there is but one God, it follows of necessity that

^d Vid. Hist. de Manich. P. ii, l. 3, ch. vi. p. 533, not. (7) T. i.

^e Vid. Huet. Origenian. l. 2, c. ii. qu. 2, n. xi. p. 37. c.

^f Ἄλλοι τινες . . . μαθηταὶ τινος τοῦ νοετοῦ, οὗ τοῦ μὲν γένος ἐκ σμύρνης, ἢ πρὸ πολλῆς χρόνου γενομένου. . . ἔφη τοῦ χριστοῦ

αὐτοὺς εἶναι τοὺς πατέρας, καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς πατέρας γεννηθῆναι καὶ πεπονηθῆναι καὶ ἀποθνήσκειναι. Hippol. contr. Hær. Noet. n. i. p. 5, 6. T. ii. Ed. Fabric.

^g Τί ἐν κακῷ ποίω δοξάζω τοῦ χριστοῦ; ib. p. 6.

^h ib. n. ii. p. 7.

‘ he suffered; forⁱ Christ was God, and he suffered for us, ‘ being the Father, that he might be able to save us.’

This is in short the history of Noetus, which is contained in that Homily, or else a fragment of some larger work. But here ought to be remembered the account formerly given (A) of the works ascribed to Hippolytus, and that few or none of them can be relied upon as genuine and uncorrupted. If this piece be his, yet it is to be feared that there are in it some interpolations. Tillemont’s observation upon this piece was, that (B) the sentiments concerning the trinity are agreeable to those of the third century. And undoubtedly many things are here expressed after the manner of the ancients. But there are also some expressions which seem to have prevailed chiefly after the Nicene council. Another thing may be fit to be observed. It is allowed that Hippolytus did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as the apostle Paul’s. But here is an expression, which some may think to be taken from thence, where the writer speaks of Christ being¹ *without sin*; see Heb. iv. 15. However this piece, for the main part, must be reckoned ancient, for the sake of several internal characters of antiquity; and because much the same account is given of Noetus by Epiphanius, though he does not say that he borrows from any other writer.

He is to be produced in the next place. In his work against heresies, he says, that^m Noetus was of Ephesus in Asia. In his Summary, or Recapitulation, he says, heⁿ was of Smyrna, as the above quoted fragment of Hippolytus does. In the large work against heresies, Epiphanius says, ‘ that^o Noetus taught ‘ a doctrine not held by the prophets, or apostles, or the church ‘ after them. For such was his pride, that he dared to say, ‘ that the Father suffered. And with a like arrogance he said, ‘ that he himself was Moses, and his brother Aaron. In the ‘ mean time the blessed presbyters of the church called him ‘ before them, and examined him about these things, and whether he had uttered such a blasphemy against the Father. ‘ At^p first he denied it, being ashamed to own a horrible and

ⁱ χριστος γαρ ην θεος, και επασχειν δι ημας αυτος ων πατηρ, ινα και σωσαι ημας δυνασθῃ. *ibid.*

(A) See ch. xxxv. p. 95, &c. And be pleased likewise to consult Beaufobre, as above, p. 553, not. (7) and p. 534.

(B) See ch. xxxv. p. 97.

γεγονως παντα οσα ειπεν ανθρωπος, εκτος αμαρτιας. Hippol. *contr. Noet.* n. xviii.

p. 18. Conf. Hebr. iv. 15. χωρις αμαρτιας.

^m Epiph. H. 57, n. i. p. 479. c.

ⁿ Anaceph. n. xi. p. 145, T. 2.

^o Adv. Hær. 57, num. 1.

^p . . . και η ταυτην βλασφημιαν περι πατρος προηγαγετο. ο δε τα πρωτα μεν πρωτο, επι τη πρεσβυτεριη αγορευον, δια το μηδενια προ αυτη εξημισαι ταυτην την δινην και ολετηριον πικριαν. *ib.* p. 480. A.

‘ pernicious doctrine, never taught by any before him. Afterwards, having propagated his mad opinion, and gained himself a few followers, about ten in number, he became more bold and open. Whereupon the presbyters call him and his adherents before them, and examine him again, as formerly: then he said, “What harm have I done? I worship one God, I acknowledge one God, and no other beside him; who was born, suffered, died.” As he persisted in that doctrine, they expelled him out of the church, together with those who were of the same opinion with him. Soon after which he and his brother died; and ⁹ they were left as apostates and outcasts, for none of the pious would bury them. After this his followers endeavoured to uphold the same doctrine, induced thereto by the like considerations with their master; for when, being examined by the presbytery, he answered, I worship one God, they replied, “Truly, that is well said, for we also worship one God, but as he ought to be worshipped. And we have also one Christ, as we know him to be, the Son of God, who suffered, died, rose again, ascended to heaven, and is at the right hand of the Father, and will come to judge the quick and the dead. This we say, according as we have been taught by the divine scriptures.”

In his Summary, Epiphanius says, ‘ that Noetus, with a few that followed him, taught Christ to ^r be Father and Son; that the same was Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. [Or, that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are the same.]’ He said, likewise, ‘ that he himself was Moses, and his brother Aaron.’ Afterwards, in the same work, in ^s the article of the Sabellians, Epiphanius says, they held the same doctrine with the Noetians, except that they denied the Father to have suffered.

Philaster writes, that ^t Noetus said, ‘ the Almighty Father himself was Christ, and that he was born, and suffered, and died. This person likewise said, that he was Moses, and his brother Elias the prophet.’

St. Augustine, who had read Philaster, and Epiphanius’s Recapitulation or Summary, but not his Panarium, or large work against heresies, writes in his book of Heresies, ‘ that ^u the

⁹ ἐρριψσαν γὰρ ὡς παραβαται, καὶ ὅδεις αὐτοὺς τῶν θεοσεβῶν περιετείλει. ib. C.

^r νοσητορα τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξε, τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἶναι πατέρα, καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Epiph. Anaceph. p. 145, n. xi.

^s Ib. p. 146, n. xvi.

^t Alii autem Noetiani, insensati ejusdem nomine Noeti, qui dicebat Patrem omnipotentem ipsum esse Chris-

tum, et ipsum natum, et ipsum passum fuisse in corpore. Hic etiam dicebat se Moysen esse, et fratrem suum Heliam prophetam. Philast. H. 53, p. 107. Ed. Fabric.

^u Noetiani a quodam Noeto, qui dicebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum. Aug. de Hær. n. xxxvi.

‘ Noetians

'Noetians were so called from one Noetus, who said that Christ 'was also the Father himself and the Holy Ghost.' This is Augustine's whole article of the Noetians. But afterwards he enlarges in the article of the Sabellians; 'Who,' he ^x says, 'are reckoned to have borrowed their opinion from Noetus. Nor does he know any good reason why Epiphanius should make 'two heresies of them, for their opinions seem to be the same; 'only Sabellius was better known than Noetus: for very few, 'at that time, knew any thing of the Noetians; but Sabellians 'were often mentioned. He adds, that some call them Praxeans, from Praxeas; and they might also be called Hermogenians, from Hermogenes, for they were both of the same opinion. Augustine farther ^y blames Epiphanius for making any difference in opinion between the Noetians and Sabellians. For instance, where he says, that the Sabellians agreed with the Noetians, except that they denied the Father to have suffered; Augustine thinks that not rightly said; and affirms, 'it was so well known that the Sabellians taught the Father to 'have suffered, that they were oftener called Patripassians than 'Sabellians: 'so Augustine in his book of Heresies. He does also ^z elsewhere treat the Sabellians as Patripassians. Rufinus, ^a upon the Creed, likewise says, that the Sabellians were called Patripassians. Moreover, ^b Augustine blames Philaster also for

^x Sabelliani ab illo Noeto, quem supra memoravimus, defluxisse dicuntur. Nam et discipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium. Sed qua causa duas hæreses eas Epiphanius computet, nescio: cum fieri potuisse videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iste famosior, et ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæresis nomen accepit. Noetiani enim difficile ab aliquo sciuntur: Sabelliani autem sunt in ore multorum. Nam et Praxeas eos a Praxeas quidam vocant; et Hermogeniani ab Hermogene vocari potuerunt: qui Praxeas et Hermogenes eadem sentientes, in Africa fuisse dicuntur. Nec tamen istæ plures sectæ sunt; sed unius sectæ plura nomina, ex his hominibus qui in ea maxime innotuerunt. Aug. ib. c. 41.

^y Unde ergo sit factum, ut Noetianos et Sabellianos, non unius hæresis duo nomina, sed tanquam duas hæreses supradictus Epiphanius poneret, liquido invenire non potui. . . . Loco quippe isto. . . . Sabelliani, inquit, similia Noeto dogmatizantes, præter hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse passum. Quomodo de Sabellianis intelligi potest, cum

sic innotuerint dicere Patrem passum, ut Patripassiani quam Sabelliani crebrius noncupentur? . . . Vel quomodo possunt intelligi quilibet eorum Patrem passum fuisse non dicere, cum dicant eundem ipsum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum? Id. ibid.

^z Nam Sabelliani dicti sunt quidam hæretici, qui vocantur Patripassiani, qui dicunt ipsum Patrem passum. Aug. Tr. 36, in Joh. Ev. p. 548, A. T. 3, P. 2. Bened. Breviter ergo hesterno die insinuavimus caritati vestræ esse hæreticos qui vocantur Patripassiani, vel a suo auctore Sabelliani. In Joh. Tr. 37, P. 552, F. ib.

^a . . . hæreseos causa Sabellii, illius profecto quæ a nostris Patripassiani appellatur; id est, quæ Patrem ipsum vel ex virgine natum dicit, et visibilem factum, vel passum affirmat in carne. Rufin. in Symb. ad artic. Credo in Deum Patrem.

^b Philaster autem Brixianus episcopus. . . . Sabellianos continuo post Noetianos ponens, Sabellius inquit, discipulus ejus, qui similitudinem sui doctoris itidem secutus est, unde et Sabelli-

making

making two several heresies, or sects, of the Noetians and Sabellians, though he was sensible of their great agreement together, and with the others above named by Augustine, and allows the Sabellians to be Patripassians as well as the Noetians.

And certainly it is fit to be observed by us, that Philaster, as well as Augustine, computes Praxeas, Hermogenes, Noetus, and Sabellius, to have all had the same doctrine concerning the Deity.

Theodoret writes to this purpose: ‘Noetus’ was of Smyrna. ‘He revived the heresy which one Epigonus first published, and Cleomenes maintained after him. The sum of their heresy is this: they say, that there is one God and Father, the Creator of all things; not appearing when he thinks fit, appearing when he pleaseth; and that the same is invisible and visible, begotten and unbegotten; unbegotten from the beginning, begotten when he pleased to be born of a virgin; impassible and immortal, and again passible and mortal. For when he was impassible, they say, he willingly suffered on the cross. Him they call both Son and Father, as occasion is. They who embraced this heresy were called Noetians. After Noetus it was maintained by Callistus, who made some additions to that impious doctrine.’

I need not translate the article in *Prædestinatus*. But there is a particular omitted by other writers; that ^dNoetus was condemned by Tranquillus, bishop of the Chalcedonians, in Syria.

These are accounts of Noetus and his opinion, which we find in ancient writers; from whence it appears probable, that he, and others who agreed with him, believed one divine person only, and denied a distinct and proper personality of the word and spirit: but their doctrine seems to be set in a bad light. It is affirmed, that they said, the Father was born, and suffered, and died, and was Christ. Beausobre, who shews a great deal of candour and equity in his judgment of those called heretics, declares, ‘that ^ethis is so absurd, and so manifestly contrary to many texts of the New Testament, that

ani postea sunt appellati, qui et Patripassiani, et Praxeani a Praxeas et Hermogeniani ab Hermogene, &c. Et tamen Noetianos et Sabellianos sub duobus numeris tamquam duas hæreses posuit; qua causa, ipse viderit. Aug. de Hær. cap. 41.

^c Ο δὲ νοτὸς, σμυρναῖος μὲν τὸ γένος ἀνακινῶντο δὲ τὴν αἵρεσιν, ἢ ἐπιγονὸς μὲν

τῆς αὐτοῦ καλῶμενος ἀπεκύνει πρῶτος, κλειόμενος δὲ παραλαβὼν ἰβειβαῖνσι. κ. λ. Theodor. H. F. l. 3, c. 3, p. 227, 228.

^d Hic damnatus est a Tranquillo episcopo Chalcedoniorum Syriæ, &c. Prædestin. H. 36, ap. Bib. Patr. Max. T. 27. p. 544. F.

^e See his Hist. de Manichée, &c. as before, p. 533.

p. 450.

‘ it appears scarce possible it should be maintained by any reasonable man ; which makes him suspect, that this was not the opinion of those persons, but a consequence, which the orthodox drew from their principles.’ This appears to me not unlikely : a passage of Augustine will confirm the supposition ; for he argues and affirms, ‘ that ^f all who are of that opinion, that the same is Father, Son, and Spirit, must also say, that the Father suffered.’ This seems to shew, that he had no proof from their own writings, or expressions, that the Sabellians, and others, whom he charges with that opinion, were Patripassians, but he inferred it from their doctrine concerning the unity and simplicity of the Deity.

Whereas it is related, that Noetus said he was Moses, and his brother Aaron : Beaufobre ^g thinks this to be ‘ an extravagance, that is not at all credible, and that renders the rest of the history more than suspected : the truth,’ says he, ‘ is this ; Noetus and his brother pretended to defend the doctrine of the unity of God taught by Moses and Aaron, and to be sent to cleanse the church from the heathen error of the plurality of gods.’ So Beaufobre. It is observable, that Theodoret makes no mention of this particular : and Philaster differs from Hippolytus and Epiphanius, who may be considered as one. They say, he declared his brother to be Aaron ; but Philaster, that he was Elias the prophet. This story seems to me to have no other foundation but this ; that some of their enemies said of Noetus and his brother, that they acted as if they had been, the one another Moses, and the other another Aaron ; whilst some other people said of them, they behaved as if they were another Moses and Elias.

Another observation of Beaufobre may be inserted here : ‘ When,’ says ^h he, ‘ the ancients describe Sabellianism, they perpetually confound the Word and the Son of God. In the theology of the church, the Word and the Son are the same person ; but in the Sabellian theology they are two very different things. The Word is not the Son of God ; he is only an attribute, a faculty, a property of the divine nature. It is ⁱ the man Jesus Christ, who became the Son of God by the communication of the Word, as Marcellus says in Eusebius. Hence it came to pass, that the Noetians reproached the or-

^f Vel quomodo possunt intelligi quilibet eorum Patrem passum fuisse non dicere, cum dicant eundem ipsum esse et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum ? Aug. De Hær. cap. xli. Vid. etiam supra not. y. p. 446.

^g See him, as before, T. i. p. 534, 535.

^h See Beaufobre, as before, Hist. de Manichée. t. i. p. 539.

ⁱ δια της προς αυτον κοινωνιας (τη λογη) υιον θεου γινεσθαι. ap. Euseb. de Ecc. Th. l. 2. c. viii. p. 113.

‘ thodox

‘thodox with ¹ introducing a strange and new language in ‘calling the Word the Son of God. That appellation [of ‘Son of God] agrees only to the man Jesus, mere man, as ‘to his nature, how great soever he was by his gifts.’ So that learned writer describes the Sabellian, or the Noetian theology, which are both one.

What Epiphanius aims at when he says the faithful, or more orthodox Christians, refused to bury Noetus and his brother, I cannot tell. Noetus had friends and followers; whose business, I think, it was to bury him and his brother when they died, as I suppose they did.

Once more: Epiphanius said that Noetus was the first who advanced the opinion he maintained; but Philaster and Augustine say, that it was the same opinion that was before taught by Praxeas and Hermogenes, and afterwards by Sabellius: and Theodoret still increases the number of those who were of this opinion about that time; for, besides those mentioned by the Latin writers, he speaks of two others, predecessors of Noetus, and another after him. And indeed learned moderns are now sensible, that what Epiphanius says is a mistake. He is ^m corrected for it by his editor and commentator Petavius. And ⁿ Huet says, that Noetus rather propagated an old heresy than invented a new one.

That there were such people as these among Christians about that time, we have clear evidence from Origen’s writings, and Eusebius’s History of him. I formerly (c) gave an account of Beryllus, once of this opinion, afterwards converted by Origen. And Origen himself refers to Beryllus, or Noetus, or some others of this sentiment, in several places of his still remaining works; particularly in his Greek Commentary upon St. Matthew, published by Huet, where ^o he speaks of ‘some who ‘founded the notion of Father and Son, making the Father ‘and Son to be one subsistence, differing only in thought and ‘names. Which sentiment, he says, is false; though those ‘persons think thereby to do honour to the Deity.’ Of these ^p

¹ ΑΛΛ’ ἐπεὶ μοι τις ἔειπεν μοι φερεῖς, Λόγον λέγων υἱόν. [id est; sed dicet mihi aliquis: Novum mihi affers, cum Verbum Filium vocas.] Hipp. contr. Noet. n. xv. p. 16. ^m Petav. Animadv. p. 224.

ⁿ Origen. l. 2. qu. 2, n. xi. p. 37.

(c) See ch. xxxviii. p. 200.

^o . . . φαντασία τῆ δοξαζέειν αὐτὸν. οἱ ποιοῦσι εἰσὶν οἱ συγχύοντες πατὸς καὶ υἱὸς εἶναι, καὶ τῇ ὑπόστασει εἶνα διδόντες εἶναι τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν, τῇ ἐπινοῇ μόνῃ καὶ τοῖς εἰρημασί διακριντες τὸ ἐν ὑποκείμενον. Orig.

in Matt. Huet. T. i. p. 470. D. Conf. Huet. in loc.

^p Sed et eos qui hominem dicunt Dominum Jesum præcognitum et prædestinatum, qui ante adventum carnalem substantialiter et proprie non extiterit: sed quod homo natus patris solam in se habuerit deitatem, &c. Vid. Pamph. Ap. ap. Hieron. T. v. Ed. Bened. p. 226, Conf. Origen. Huet. ubi supra p. 37, Vid. etiam Origen. in Rom. cap. x. p. 588. m.

Origen

Origen is supposed to speak in a passage of his Commentary upon Titus, preserved in Pamphilus's Apology for him, which we have now in Latin only. An anonymous author of an Apology for Origen, in ^q Photius, speaks of Origen's having opposed, or written against the Sabellian heresy; which, as ^r Huet explains it, ought not to be understood of Sabellius himself, who did not appear till after Origen, but of Noetus, or some other persons who held the like unitarian sentiment. And ^s in his Greek Commentary upon St. John's gospel, Origen says, that many well disposed persons went into that opinion to avoid polytheism. Perhaps Origen has an eye to this same thing in his books against Celsus. That Epicurean had ridiculed the veneration which Christians had for the Son of God. Origen, in his answer, ^{*} says; 'Grant, that in a vast multitude of believers, some, differing from the rest, should rashly affirm our Saviour to be the great God over all: nevertheless, we do not hold any such thing, believing what he himself says; *The Father that sent me is greater than I.*' See John xiv. 28. Cyprian ^t likewise, among other heretics, mentions Patripassians.

Though the writers above transcribed may have been guilty of some mistakes in their History of Noetus, and their representation of his sentiment; yet we are very much indebted to them, upon the whole, for the accounts they have left us, and in particular for the testimony they bear to Noetus and his followers, that they received the holy scriptures, and depended upon them; how much soever in the judgment of these writers they may have misunderstood and misinterpreted them. Of this we are now to take notice.

In the piece ascribed to Hippolytus, of which we have already made so much use, it is said, the Noetians argued for their opinion in this manner: 'It ^u is written in the law; *I am the God of your fathers, ye shall have no other gods beside me.*' See Exod. iii. 6. xx. 3. 'And ^x again in another place: *I, saith he, am the first, and the last, and beside me there is no other.* Thus ^y they say they prove there is but one God.' See Is. xli. 4. xlv. 6. xlv. 5. They insisted likewise upon Is. xlv. 14. 'You

^q Cod. 117, p. 296.

^r Huet. Origen. p. 37.

^s Καὶ το πολλὰς φιλοθεῖας εἶναι εὐχομένης ταρασσοῦ κ. λ. Orig. Comm. in Jo. p. 46. D. T. 2. Huet.

^t Εἰσὶν οὖν τινες ὡς ἐκ πολλῶν πιστευόντων, καὶ διχονοῦντες διαφωνοῦντες, διὰ τὴν προσηγορίαν υποτιθεσθαι τὸν σωτῆρα εἶναι τὸν μεγίστον ἐπὶ πάντων θεῶν· ἀλλ' ἔτι γε ἡμεῖς τοῦτο, κ. λ. Or.

contr. Cels. l. 8, p. 387. Cant. § 14, p. 752. E. Bened.

^u Vid. Cypr. ad Jub. Ep. 73, p. 200.

^x Οἱ γὰρ διζῆσαι βυλονται συγασιν τῶ δογματι, λεγοντες, ἵππιν ἐν τομῶ· Εγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, κ. λ. Hippol. contr. Noet. n. ii. p. 6.

^y ib. p. 6, 7.

^z ἢ ὡς φασκεσθαι συγασιν ἐνὰ θεῷ. ib.

‘see,’ say they, ‘how the scriptures declare one God.’ They add; ‘We^a can go no farther, for the apostle also acknowledgeth one God, saying, *whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.*’ The^b like things are to be seen in Epiphanius. The author, supposed to be Hippolytus, replies to the foregoing argument: ‘The^c scriptures speak truth, but Noetus does not understand them. But though Noetus does not understand, the scriptures nevertheless are not to be laid aside.’ In this piece against the Noetians, there are many texts alleged out of the gospels, and Paul’s epistles, and the book of the Revelation, and some out of the^d book of the Acts of the apostles; which shews, that these people received the scriptures of the New Testament, as other Christians did.

In the same piece against Noetus is this remarkable passage: ‘There^e is indeed, brethren, one God, whom we can know no otherwise but from the holy scriptures. For, as he who is desirous to learn the wisdom of this world must acquaint himself with the sentiments of philosophers, if he would obtain his end; in like manner, whoever of us are desirous to understand religion, and be truly pious, should apply ourselves to the oracles of God. Whatever therefore the divine scriptures declare, that let us embrace; what they teach, let us learn; and as the Father willeth we should believe, so let us believe; as he willeth [or requireth] the Son should be honoured, so let us honour him; as he willeth^f the Holy Ghost should be given, so let us accept; not according to any particular pre-conceived opinion, nor according to any particular notion of ours, nor wresting the oracles given by God; but so understanding things as he has been pleased to shew them to us by the holy scriptures.’ In a note upon this passage, Fabricius observes, that it contains a signal testimony concerning the sufficiency of scripture. I think it likewise to be herein implied, that the Noetians were strenuous assertors of the authority of holy scripture.

^a Ορας, φησιν, πως ενα θεον κηρυσσουν αι γραφαι. ib. p. 7.

^b Αλλο δε, φησιν, η δυναμιθα λεγειν· και γαρ ο αποστολος ενα θεον ομολογει, λεγων· ων οι πατερις, εξ ων ο χριστος το καλα σαρκα, ο ων επι παντων βιος ευλογητος εις της αιωνας. ib. p. 7.

^c Vid. Epiph. H. 57, num. ii. iii.

^d αι μιν γραφαι ορθως λεγουσιν, αλλα αν και νουτος νοει· Οικ νου δε ει νουτος μη νοει,

παρα τυτο εκκλητοι αι γραφαι. ib. num. iii. p. 7.

^e Vid. ib. num. vi. p. 11, n. xiii. p. 15, n. xviii. p. 19.

^f ib. n. ix. p. 12, 13.

^g . . και ως θελει πνευμα αγιον δωρισθαι, λαβωμεν· Μη κατ’ ιδιαν προαιρεσιν, κατ’ ιδιον νου, μηδε βιαζομενοι τα υπο τη θεη δεδομενα, αλλ’ ον τροπον αυτος εβληθη δια των αγιων γραφων δειξαι, οτως ιδωμεν. ibid.

Epiphanius

Epiphanius confirms our allegations from the forementioned writer ; for in his article of the Noetians he quotes many books of the Old and New Testament, and has this passage, with which I conclude this article. ‘ So that,’ says he, ‘ the writings [or oracles] of the prophets agree with those of the apostles, and the apostles agree with the evangelists, and the evangelists with the apostles, and the apostles with the prophets.’

After this there can be no reason to think, that the Noetians rejected any books of scripture generally received by Christians at that time, or that they shewed a less regard to them ; though they did not understand them altogether as some others did.

One thing should be observed here : if the piece against Noetus be really a work of Hippolytus, the extracts now made out of it afford additions to his testimony to the scriptures, as (D) formerly exhibited by me : but when I composed that chapter, I doubted the genuineness of this piece, and therefore was cautious of making much use of it ; nor am I yet fully satisfied in that point. I have therefore quoted this fragment, or homily, as an ancient piece ascribed to Hippolytus ; but possibly interpolated in some places since it’s original composition.

It was fit I should give the history I have now done of Noetus and his followers. There follow some articles in Epiphanius, which appear to be but inconsiderable. Nevertheless I shall give some account of them likewise. If I should quite omit them, they might be thought by some to be more material than they are.

II. The next article in Epiphanius is that of the Valesians. They dwell, as ^b he gueffeth, at Bacathus, a considerable village of Philadelphia in Arabia. He says, they are most of them eunuchs, and make those so who come over to them : they have also, as he adds, some other heretical notions and shameful practices : they ⁱ reject the law and the prophets : so writes Epiphanius in his Summary or Recapitulation.

In his larger work against heresies he says, ‘ We ¹ have often heard of the Valesians ; but we could never learn who their leader Vales [or Valens] was, where he lived, whence he came, what were his principles, precepts, or sayings : but his

^ε όπως συναδῇ τα προφητικά τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς, κ. λ. Epiph. H. 57, p. 486. B.

(D) See Chap. xxxv.

^b Epiphanius. Anaceph. T. 2, p. 145.

ⁱ ἀφαιρῶντες τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰς προφη-

τας. *ibid.* ¹ Περὶ Οὐαλησιῶν ἀκούομεν πολ-
λακίς, ὡς μὲν τοὶ ἰσχυροὶ πᾶσι, πῆς, ἢ ποθεν ὤρ-
ματο, ἢ τί λαλῶν, ἢ ἰσχυρῶν, ἢ φθιγγομένων
οὐ Οὐαλης ἔτος. Adv. H. 38. p. 489.

name being Arabic, I suspect him to be of the same opinion with some who live at Bacathus in Philadelphia beyond Jordan, and are called Gnostics by the people of the country; although they are not Gnostics, for their opinions are different. What we have learned of them is to this purpose: at first they were of the church, but after a while, when they were increased, they separated from it: they are all eunuchs: when any embrace their institution, they are obliged to forbear all flesh, till they have been made eunuchs, either with their own consent, or by force; then they may eat what they please. Nor do they only serve their own people in that manner, but others also, strangers and travellers, as is commonly said. Epiphanius, having given that account of this sect and their principles, proceeds to argue against them from the New Testament.

These people are not mentioned by Philaster, nor Theodoret.

Augustine^m agrees with Epiphanius; and it is manifest he had no other knowledge of these people than what he had from him.

The author of *Prædestinatus* follows Augustine; but he adds one thing omitted by the other two; thatⁿ the Valefians were condemned by a synod of Achaia. I wish that author had told us whence he had this particular.

Damascen has nothing beside what is in the Recapitulation of Epiphanius.

It is plain that this was a very obscure sect, if ever there was such an one. Epiphanius indeed says, he had often heard of them: however he seems not to have known any thing in particular concerning them, but what he had received by doubtful and uncertain information. If ever there were such people, they seem to have received the books of the New Testament without scruple: for, though Epiphanius says they rejected the law and the prophets, he brings no charge against them with regard to the New Testament, either of adding to it, or detracting from it; and in his brief confutation of them, he alleges divers texts of St. Matthew's gospel, and another from the first epistle to the Corinthians. I do not pretend to assign any particular period to these heretics, whose very existence is uncertain.

III. The next article in Epiphanius (whose order is followed likewise by Augustine, the author of *Prædestinatus*, and John Da-

^m Valefii et se ipsos castrant, et hospites suos, hoc modo existimantes Deo se debere servire. Alia quoque hæretica docere dicuntur et turpia: sed quæ illa sint, nec ipse commemoravit Epiphanius, nec uspiam potui reperire. Aug. de Hær. cap. 37.

ⁿ Hi a synodo sunt damnati Achaie.

mascen,)

mascen,) is that of the Pure, or Novatians. But of them I say nothing now, intending to speak of them in the history of their founder Novatus; or, as he is more commonly called, Novatian. After them follow Angelics: of whom Epiphanius says, in his Summary, that ^o they were then no where to be found, but had entirely ceased. They seem to have been so called, either because they boasted of their having an angelical institution, or else because they invoked angels.

In his larger work Epiphanius says, 'We ^p have heard of the heresy, [or sect] of the Angelics, but it is by name only: for we could never gain any certain information wherein their heresy consisted; probably because it hastened to its period soon after it had sprung up. Nor do we so much as know, certainly, what was the original of the name: whether it was, because they said the world was formed by angels; as some have done, or ^a that they boasted of being an angelic sort of people, and that they lived a most excellent life; or whether they had their name from some place; for ^t there is a country beyond Mesopotamia, called Ingilin, [or Angelin.] About this we can say nothing positively.'

This is the account which Epiphanius gives of these people. It is his usual method to add, after the history of any heretics, a confutation of them. But he forbears to attempt any thing of that nature here, not knowing what their principles were.

Philaster makes no express mention of these Angelics. Nor is there any thing concerning them in Theodoret.

Augustine ^s says, 'they were inclined to the worship of angels, and that Epiphanius assures us, they had ceased in his time.' This shews that Augustine had no particular knowledge of this sect.

Let us however take the account in Prædestinatus: it may serve to convince us that he is an author not to be relied upon. 'The thirty-ninth heresy,' says ^t he, 'is that of the Angelics. They chose to be so called: for they say that angels ought to be adored and revered in the mind, and that prayers ought to be presented to them; that, as they are able, they may be induced by the petitions of men to give them help. Epiphanius assures us that these people had quite ceased, having been over-

Prædestin. l. i. c. 37. ^o . . . οἱ πάντες
ὡς ἐξελίπον. αὐχρῆτις δὲ πᾶσι ἀγγελικῇ
τάξει ἔχειν, ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀγγέλους προσκυνεῖν.
Epiph. Anac. p. 146, n. 14. ^p H. 60,
p. 505. ^a οἱ διὰ τὸ ἐν τάξει ἀγγέλων
ἐαυτοὺς σιμνεῖν, κ. λ. ib. c. ^t . . . ἐπειδὴ
χαρὸς τις ἐστὶ Ἰγγιλιν. ib. ^s Angelici,

in angelorum cultum inclinati, quos Epiphanius jam omnino desecisse testatur. Aug. de Hær. c. 39. ^t . . . Hi Angelicos se vocari voluerunt. Dicunt enim angelos debere adorari et excoli animo, et ipsis preces effundi. . . . Hos Epiphanius jam omnino desecisse testatur,

‘ come by Theophilus, bishop of Apamea.’ So this writer. But Epiphanius says no such thing, nor yet Augustine, nor ^u John Damascen; who has nothing more relating to this sect, than what was transcribed above from the Summary of Epiphanius.

The reader has a right to think for himself: but possibly some will be of opinion, that there never was any sect of this name distinct from all others; and that Angelics is only an appellation, sometimes bestowed in the way of ridicule, upon some rigid and conceited sect, which ordinarily went under another denomination.

IV. The people next mentioned by Epiphanius, are ‘ the ^{*} Apostolics; who,’ as he says, ‘ are also called Apotactics, [or Renouncers.] They are to be found in Pisidia. They receive none ^{*} but renouncers; [that is, such as are of the same opinion with ^{*} themselves.] They mightily resemble the Encratites, though ^{*} they have some notions different from theirs.’ So writes Epiphanius in his Recapitulation. And ^v the Encratites are summarily described by him in the same work after this manner; ‘ That they condemned marriage as proceeding from Satan, and ^{*} forbid the eating any kind of animal food.’

In the Panarium he writes: ‘ Others there are who call themselves Apostolics and Apotactics: for this is their darling ^{*} maxim, to possess ^{*} nothing. They are a sort of sprout from ^{*} Tatian’s sect, partaking of the principles of the Encratites, Tatianists, and Pure. They divide and wound the holy church ^{*} of God by their superstition and will-worship. They likewise ^{*} overthrow the divine clemency; for they no more receive any ^{*} one that has once offended. With regard to marriage and other ^{*} matters, their sentiments have a near affinity with those of the ^{*} people before spoken of: [that is, the Novatians.] But ^{*} whereas the Pure are contented with the scriptures commonly ^{*} received, these are very fond of the Acts of Andrew and Thomas, and ^{*} are altogether averse to the ecclesiastical canon.’ He afterwards says, that ^b this sect is confined to a very small tract, and are no where to be found but in Phrygia, Cilicia, and Pamphylia.

In his confutation of these people, Epiphanius quotes the gospels, the Acts, and divers of St. Paul’s epistles, very freely. He argues, from reason and scripture, that marriage is not de-

victos ^a Theophilo Apameo episcopo. ^δ παρ’ αυτοις το μηδεν κεινησθαι. Adv. H. Præd. l. i. h. 39. ^u Vid. Joh. Dam. 61, n. i. p. 506. B. ^z . . . παντα πασιν de Hær. cap. 60, ap. Coteler. Mon. Gr. αλλοτριον τε καινος τε εκκλησιαστικον. ib. c. T. i. p. 295. ^x Anac. p. 146, n. xv. ^b H. ii. p. 507. ^v Ib. p. 144, n. i. ^z . . . φυλαττιται

But
in Da-
what

some
e dif-
tion,
and
omi-

the *
or Re-
none
with
ough
Epi-
sum-
ner;
, and

hem-
rling
from

Ta-
urch

ewife
e any

other
f the

But
only

Tho-
non.

small
and

the
eely.

de-

v. H.
πρασιν
ib. c.

ling

filing or abominable; and that there is no crime in being rich, when an estate has descended to any by legal inheritance, or has been gained in the way of honest industry and fair dealing, and is employed in good uses. However the church, too, as he adds, has it's renouncers; but then it does not teach them to be proud and arrogant, and to despise and condemn all others. If ^c any are disposed to part with their goods, and aim at an apostolical life, they are at liberty; provided they still maintain favourable sentiments of other men, and keep up a friendly correspondence with them. The same is to be said of those who forbear marriage, provided they do not look upon it as a thing abominable in itself, and refuse not communion with those who are so contracted. The church, says he, may be compared to a ship, which does not consist of one plank only, but of many: beside the keel, it has it's fore-castle, and stern, masts, and sails, and anchors; it's company too is various, and it refuses none but robbers and pirates. In like manner the church excludes none but great and scandalous sinners: it receives all who are sincerely desirous to be saved, and ^d conducts them all to salvation in the way suitable to their several capacities, stations, and conditions. So Epiphanius.

The Apostolics are not mentioned in Philaster or Theodoret.

Augustine ^e says, 'that these people arrogantly called themselves Apostolics, or Apostolical, because they received not any into communion who lived in the marriage state, or that possessed any thing of their own. Indeed, the catholic church has many such, both monks and clergy: but these are therefore heretics, because they separate themselves from the church, and allow no hopes of salvation to those who enjoy such things as they have not. They resemble the Encratites, and are likewise called Apotactics; but they are also reported to teach some other, I know not what, heretical things peculiar to themselves.'

The author of *Prædestinatus* ^f so agrees with Augustine, that no particular notice needs to be taken of him.

Damascen has nothing beside the Recapitulation of Epiphanius; and entirely agrees with it, except that, whereas it is

^c Ib. n. iv. p. 508.

^d ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὴν πάντας σώζειν, ἔχαστον δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν πραγματείαν καὶ σωτηρίαν. ib. n. iv. p. 509. B. ^e Apostolici, qui se isto nomine arrogantissime vocaverunt, eo quod in suam communionem non recipere utentes conjugibus et res proprias

possidentes: quales habet catholica et monachos et clericos plurimos. Sed ideo isti hæretici sunt, quoniam se ab ecclesia separantes, nullam spem putant eos habere, qui utuntur his rebus, quibus ipsi carent, &c. Aug. de Hær. cap. 40. ^f Hær. 49, apud Bib. Patr. T. 27, p. 549. H.

there said, the Apostolics are to be found in Pisidia, he says, they ^ε had their rise there.

The time of this people does not appear: however, it is observable, that the Apostolics, as well as Angelics, are placed after the Pure, or Novatians, and a great way below Tatian and the Encratites, both in Epiphanius and the other writers that mention them. They renounced the world, and condemned all others that did not: this was their peculiar principle, against which Epiphanius has argued very well; his confutation of them is a rational and sensible performance. But perhaps it may be questioned, whether there ever was any sect of this name different from all others. The reasons of this doubt are such as these: they are not mentioned by Philaster, or Theodoret. Augustine seems not to have known any thing of them, but what he had learned from Epiphanius. Whereas if there had been any such people, who arose after the Novatians, one would think they should have been well known to those learned ancients. According to all the accounts we have of them, they mightily resembled the Encratites and Novatians. Possibly therefore, Apostolic, or Apostolical, is nothing but a different appellation of some rigid sect, that ordinarily went by another name; whose rigid sentiment too, as may be supposed, is here aggravated beyond truth and reality. If, after all, there ever was such a sect, it made little progress, and had but a short duration. What Epiphanius says, therefore, of their admiring the Acts of Andrew and Thomas, needs not to give us much concern.

V. The next article in Epiphanius, and the writers that follow him, is that of the Sabellians; of whom I have already taken some notice in this chapter, in the article of Noetus, and shall be obliged to say more in the (E) history of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria. After them follow two distinct articles, concerning two different sorts of people, called Origenists; the former generally called impure, or infamous Origenists: of whom, in his Recapitulation, Epiphanius says, that ^h they were so called from a certain Origen. In his Panarium, or larger work against heresies, he declares, that he ⁱ did not know from whom they were so called, whether from Origen Adamantius, or from some other; all he could say was, that he understood they were called Origenists. The others ^l he plainly speaks of, as so named

^ε Και αυτοι περι πισιδαν ορισμενοι. Joh. Dam. ap. Cotel. Mon. G. T. i. p. 296.

(E) See Chap. xliii. num. vii. ^h . . .

τινος οριγενους. Anaceph. p. 146, n. xvii.

ⁱ καλονται δε οριγενοι ε πανν δε σαφως ισ-

μεν τινος ειναι, η απο οριγενους τε αδαμαντιν, καλημενη συντακτη, η αλλη τιμος ειναι, αγνωσ. κ. λ. adv. H. 63, n. i. Vid. etiam H. 64, n. 3, p. 526. D. ^l Vid. Anaceph. p. 146, num. 18. Adv. Hær. 64, n. i.

e says,
is ob-
placed
an and
s that
ed all
gainst
ion of
it may
name
uch as
doret.
t what
been
think
ients,
ghtily
efore,
lation
whose
d be-
sect,
What
drew

t fol-
ready
, and
ysius,
cles,
; the
: of
ere so
work
hom
from
were
med

αντι-
ι, α-
m H.
ceph.
n. i.

from

from Origen, called Adamantius, the famous writer, and son of Leonides, the blessed and holy martyr. Of these last I say nothing here, not choosing to give any farther account of the opinions of Origen, or his followers and admirers, than I have already done in the history of him: it is no necessary part of my design, nor will it be expected of me by any body.

Of the former Origenists, Epiphanius says, they ^m were guilty of things not fit to be mentioned. He charges them with licentious principles, as well as shameful practices; and says, that they resembled those called Gnostics. They ⁿ received and read, as he adds, divers scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and also some apocryphal scriptures, particularly those called the Acts of Andrew, and of some others. Augustine, who had read only the Recapitulation of Epiphanius, follows that work, saying, that ^o these Origenists were not so called from that Origen, who was well known to almost every body, but from some other, he knew not whom: then he adds in general, as from Epiphanius, that they were guilty of shameful actions. Augustine plainly had no knowledge of this people, beside what he had from that writer. The author ^p of *Prædestinatus* follows Augustine, but adds a particular of his own head; that this sect had it's original from a wicked Syrian, named Origen. John Damascen ^q has nothing different from the Recapitulation of Epiphanius.

It is disputed by learned moderns, whom these people followed, and from whom they were named. Basnage ^r thinks it likely, that there was some other Origen, unknown to us, who was the author of this sect. I do not perceive that ^s Tillemont determines this question one way or other. Baronius ^t thought there was but one Origen about this time, and that these Origenists had their name from him: of this opinion too are ^u Huet and ^x Pagi; who deserve to be consulted; comparing likewise a note of the Benedictines, upon the forty-second chapter of Augustine's book of Heresies. I cannot but own, that I am much inclined to be of the same opinion: and, if I may be allowed to proceed somewhat farther, I would say, it seems to me that

^m Vid. Anac. ubi supra. Adv. H. 63, p. 520. . . . 524. ⁿ γραφας δε ητοι αναγι-
νωσκον διαφορης καινης και παλαιας διαθη-
κης. adv. H. 63, n. i. p. 520. Κεχρηται
δε, ως εφη, διαφοροις γραφαις, και καινης δι-
αθηκης, και αποκρυφους τισι, μαλιστα ταις
λεγομεναις πραξεσιν ανδρων και των αλλων.
ib. n. ii. in. ^o . . . a quodam Origine
dicti sunt, non illo qui fere omnibus no-
tus est, sed ab alio nescio quo, &c. Aug.

de H. c. 42. ^p . . . sed ab alio Syro
quodam sceleratissimo. Præd. ib. c. 42.
^q Dam. de Hær. c. 63. u. s. ^r Quidni
igitur ignotus et Origenes aliquis turpi-
bus Origenistis se fontem præbuit? Basn.
A. 203, num. 25. ^s Tillem. Origene
Art. 26, M. E. T. 3. P. 3, p. 209, 210.
^t Baron. Ann. 256, n. 47. ^u Orige-
nian. l. i. c. i. n. vii. p. 5. ^x Pagi,
253, n. 25.

this whole story of the impure Origenists is without foundation. For, first, it depends entirely upon the authority of Epiphanius: this appears from what was observed before. Secondly, the account is in itself improbable; there are wicked people at all times: but it exceeds all bounds of probability, that men should avow principles and practices so absurd and shameful as those imputed to this people. Farther, thirdly, these people made high pretensions to strict piety: for, as ^γ Epiphanius says, they spoke disadvantageously of marriage, as not sufficiently pure; and ^ζ they had among them men and women who professed a monastic, or solitary life; and ^α they sometimes censured the looseness of other Christians, finding fault with those ecclesiastics who had subintroduced women in their houses. The account thereof in Epiphanius is inconsistent, and overthrows itself. Fourthly, if Epiphanius had had any certain knowledge, or good information, concerning this people, as a distinct sect, he would have been able to say whom they followed: but he owns he was an absolute stranger as to that point. This sect, therefore, of impure Origenists is a fictitious and imaginary sect; owing it's supposed existence to the calumnies of some bitter enemies of Origen and his admirers; the credulity of Epiphanius, and his too great facility in receiving the stories brought to him; together with his favourable sentiments of the virtue of the great Origen: for, being persuaded that ^β Origen was a good man, when some angry, not to say wicked, people brought him the relations he refers to, he concluded there was some sect called Origenists, whose rise and original he could not account for: whereupon he makes a distinct heresy of them.

It is easy to suppose there were shameful things done by some called Origenists; but so there were likewise by those who were for appropriating the title of good catholics to themselves: and perhaps such things were no where more frequent than among those who affected a monastic life. But I can see no good reason to make a new sect, for the sake of accounts which have so much the appearance of proceeding from the enmity and bitterness of a party spirit,

We need not labour to settle the time of these people; they were in being in the time of Epiphanius, and probably had their beginning when some persons were first distinguished by the name of Origenists. I have spoken of them here out of

^γ αβιτησι δε γαμον. H. 63, n. i. ^β οσι δε οηβη των εν τη εκκλησια των αγαπητας
p. 520. D. ^α οι μεν γαρ ισι προσ- λεγομενας συνεισακτες γυναικας κεκτημενων.
χηματι μοναζοντων, αι δε συν αυτοις ησαι ib. n. ii. in. ^β Vid. Epiphan. H. 64.
προσχηματι μοναζουσιν. ib. ^α κατηγο- n. ii. iii.

regard to the order in which they are placed by Epiphanius; and because I was willing to put together some things of a like nature, and which are not of the utmost importance.

Nor need we to be at all concerned about what is said of their making use of some apocryphal scriptures, particularly the Acts of Andrew, and of some others; for they who forged the other calumnies against this people, that is the Origenists, or some of the followers of the great Origen, would make no scruple to add a particular or two of this sort: and yet perhaps they did use some such writings, but not as writings of authority, any more than other Christians did.

Next after the two last mentioned articles, succeeds in Epiphanius, and divers other authors who write of heresies, that of Paul of Samosata. I shall have occasion to take notice of this in the history of the above-named (F) Dionysius.

C H A P. XLII.

St. GREGORY, bishop of Neocæsarea.

I. *His history.* II. *Testimonies to him.* III. *His time.* IV. *His works.* V. *His character.* VI. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament.*

I, I HAVE already mentioned Gregory of Neocæsarea in Pontus, as (A) one of Origen's most noted scholars, and (B) an account of Origen's letter to him. It is fit we should now have a more particular history of this renowned convert and bishop, of the best times, or near them; who is usually called Thaumaturgus, or the Wonder-worker, for the many and great miracles wrought by him.

Says Jerom, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, 'Theodore, who was afterwards called Gregory, bishop of Neocæsarea

(F) See Ch. xliii. num. viii.

(A) Chap. xxxviii. vol. ii. (B) p. 209.

^a Theodorus, qui postea Gregorius appellatus est, Neocæsareæ Ponti episcopus, admodum adolescens, ob studia Græcarum et Latinarum literarum, de Cappadocia Berytum, et inde Cæsaream Palestinæ transiit, juncto sibi fratre Athenodoro. Quorum cum egregiam indolem vidisset Origines, hortatus est eos ad philosophiam; in qua paulatim fidem introducens, sui quoque sectatores

reddidit. Quinquennio itaque eruditi ab eo remittuntur ad matrem, e quibus Theodorus proficiscens παννυχιον ευχαριστίας scripsit Origeni, et convocata grandi frequentia, ipso quoque Origene præsentē, recitavit, qui usque hodie exstat. Scripsit et μεταφρασιν in ecclesiasten brevem quidem sed valde utilem. Et aliæ hujus vulgo feruntur epistolæ, sed præcipue signa atque miracula, quæ jam episcopus cum multa ecclesiarum gloria perpetravit. Hieron. De Vir. Ill. c. 65.

‘rea in Pontus, being yet very young, for the sake of Greek and
 ‘Roman learning, came with his brother Athenodorus from Cap-
 ‘padocia to Berytus, and thence to Cæsarea in Palestine. Origen,
 ‘perceiving their fine genius, recommended to them the study
 ‘of philosophy, with which he gradually instilled into them the
 ‘faith of Christ, and took them into the number of his disci-
 ‘ples. Having staid with him five years, they returned to their
 ‘mother: [perhaps it should be country.] Theodore, before
 ‘he went away, composed a panegyric oration, to thank Origen,
 ‘and recited it in a numerous audience, Origen being present;
 ‘which is still extant. He wrote likewise a short, but very use-
 ‘ful, paraphrase upon the book of Ecclesiastes. There are also
 ‘several of his epistles to be found. But he is chiefly famous
 ‘for the miracles he wrought when bishop, to the great honour
 ‘of the churches.’

That is a summary of Gregory’s whole life. There is an au-
 thentic history of the former part of it in the farewell, or panegy-
 rical oration at Cæsarea, just mentioned, which was spoken in
 the year 238 or 239, as is generally supposed; though perhaps
 some may place it a few years sooner.

Gregory’s parents ^b were Gentiles. He lost his father when he
 was not more than fourteen years of age. Having received those
 rudiments of learning which are usually taught young persons of
 a plentiful condition, his ^c mother sent him and his brother
 Athenodorus to a master of rhetoric. He had besides another
 master to teach him the Latin tongue; not indeed with a design
 he should speak it, but that he might not be altogether ignorant
 of the language of the empire. This master was well skilled in the
 Roman laws. He earnestly recommended that study to his schol-
 ar: Gregory complied, and his master taught him with great ap-
 plication. It happened that at this time Gregory’s sister mar-
 ried to a lawyer, in esteem with the governor of Palestine, and
 chosen by him to be one of his assessors or counsellors, was sent
 for by her husband to come to him at Cæsarea. The ^d officer,
 who came to conduct the lady to her husband, brought with him
 a good number of carriages, more than sufficient for her and her
 necessary attendants; and Gregory was induced to accompany
 his sister to Cæsarea, partly with a view of accomodating her
 and rendering her journey more agreeable, partly because of the
 convenience that offered for going to Berytus in Phœnicia, where

^b Gregor. Orat. Paneg. ad Orig. p. 55. *αγενεις διδεν και φυτας και τριφομενους, φοι-
 B. Ed. Paris. 1621. ^c εδουκε τη μοιη εκ-
 των γονεων κηδεσθαι ημων παραλειπομενη μη-
 τρι, τ’ αλλα εκπαιδευομενους, οια παιδας εκ
 P. 56. B. ^d P. 57. B. C.*

he might improve himself in the law under the celebrated professors of that science who resided there. Thus Gregory, by attending his sister, was conducted not to Berytus, but to Cæsarea, where ^e Origen was newly arrived from Alexandria, as if on purpose to meet them.

As soon as Origen saw Gregory and his brother Athenodorus, he was desirous of retaining them with him; and he neglected no means to inspire them with a love of philosophy, as ^f a foundation of true religion and piety. At length they were persuaded by the force of his arguments, and the charms of his conversation. Of ^g Origen they learned logic, physics, geometry, astronomy, ethics. He ^h encouraged them likewise in the reading of all sorts of ancient authors, poets and philosophers, whether Greeks or barbarians; restraining them from none but such as denied a deity or a providence, from whom no possible advantage could be obtained. But ⁱ above all he inculcated a diligent attention to the mind of God, as revealed in the prophets; he himself explaining to them the obscure and difficult passages, when any such occurred; as certainly, says Gregory, there are many such in the sacred scriptures.

This is a very brief abstract of that oration, which, I think, if read throughout, must appear a monument of the composer's eminent abilities, and demonstrate likewise Origen's excellent method of educating those who were under his care; which indeed is honourable both to himself and the Christian profession of that age.

Gregory now left Cæsarea with much regret. What was the reason is not certain; though there are some expressions ^k near the conclusion of the oration, which may lead us to think that some affairs of the family required his presence at home.

Gregory, of Nyssa in Cappadocia, brother of St. Basil, who flourished ^l about the year 372, and about a hundred years after Thaumaturgus, has left us a panegyric upon him, entitled, An Oration upon the Life of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus. We can by

* Τον δὲ ἱερὸν τῆς ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τῆς Αἰγυπτῆς ἐκ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρινῆς πόλεως, εἰς τὴν ἑστῶσαν ἔχον ἔτυχε προτίσσειν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκείνῃ καὶ μετανοήσῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ τοῦ χάριτος, ὡς περ ἀπαντήσονται ἡμῖν, ἑστῶσαν πρᾶγμα. p. 57. B. ^f Οὐ τοίνυν ἡδὲ εὐσεβίᾳ ὅλως δύναται εἶναι ἐφασκεῖν, ὁρθῶς λέγων, μὴ φιλοσοφῆσαντι. p. 59. C. ^g P. 63, 64, 65. ^h Φιλοσοφῶν μὲν γὰρ ἤξει ἀναλεγόμενης τῶν ἀρχαίων πάντα ὅσα καὶ φιλοσοφῶν καὶ ὑμῶν δὲν ἐστὶν γράμματα πασῇ δύναμει μὴδὲν ἐκποιήσας, μὴδ' ἀποδοκιμάζοντας . . . πλην ὅσα τῶν ἀδελφῶν εἴη, ὅσοι . . . ἢ καὶ εἶναι Θεοῦ, ἢ προνοίας, λυγροῦ . . . τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς πασὶν ἐν-

τυγχάνειν καὶ προσομιλεῖν, γένος μὲν ἡδὲ ἐν, ἡδὲ λόγῳ φιλοσοφῶν προτιμησάντας, οὗτοι αὐτὸν ἀποδοκιμάσαντας, ἢ ἑλληνικῶν, ἢ βαρβαρῶν, πάντων δὲ ἀκηρόντας, p. 69. C. D.

ⁱ μόνῃ δὲ προσεχίῃ Θεῷ, καὶ τοῖς τῆς προφηταίας, αὐτὸς υποφθηνῶν καὶ σαφηνίζων, ὅτι ποτε σκοτεινὸν καὶ ἀνιγματοειδὲς ἦ, ὅσα πολλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐστὶ φωναῖς. ib. p. 72. D.

^k Φερόντες ἐκ τῶν σπερμάτων καὶ τῆς καρπῆς καὶ τὰς δραχμίδας, τέλει μὲν ἔχοντες. πῶς γὰρ; οἷός ἐστι δύναται ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν πολιτείᾳ πράξεων. κ. λ. p. 76. C. D. ^l Vid. Pag. Crit. in Baron. 369, xvii.

no means omit to take particular notice of this piece; but I shall transcribe only the most material things, and in as brief a manner as is suitable to our design.

The native country of our author, whom Nyssen calls the Great Gregory, was Pontus, his city Neocæsarea, and his family was rich and noble. But ^m these things, the advantages of that country, the splendour of his city, the honourable offices and titles of his ancestors, he forbears to insist on, having more important things to mention. His parents were involved in the error and folly of idolatry, which ⁿ Gregory abandoned, and became a disciple of the gospel, when he was enriched with the treasures of all the Greek learning; herein resembling Moses, of whom the scripture says, that *he was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians*, Acts vii. 22. Thus our Gregory ^o renounced heathenism, at a time when he was able to judge of the strength or the weakness of all the Gentile philosophy and theology.

Nyssen says, that ^p Gregory studied secular learning for some time at Alexandria, where there was a great resort of youth from all parts for the sake of philosophy and medicine. Our young Gregory ^q was even then distinguished by the sobriety and discretion of his behaviour. And a lewd woman having been employed by some idle people to disgrace him by indirect but impudent insinuations of intimacy with her, his reputation was vindicated in a remarkable manner: for the woman was immediately seized with such horrible fits, as demonstrated them to be a judgment of Heaven; nor ^r was she relieved from the dæmon that had taken possession of her, till Gregory had interceded with God for her, and obtained the pardon of her fault.

Hitherto Gregory was a heathen; but his conversion was near: for soon after this he ^s was conducted to Origen, then the chief master of the Christian philosophy, and still celebrated for his writings. To his instructions Gregory now committed himself; and when he returned into his native country, as Nyssen says, he retired from the world to a private life in a desert place.

^m ἀλλ' ὅδε τῶν προγόνων αὐτοῦ τῶν προκαθηνησαμένων τῆς κατὰ σάρκα γένεως μνημὴν ἐπὶ τῇ λόγῳ ποιησόμεαι, πλεόντων καὶ φιλοτιμίας, καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς περιφανίας αὐτῶν ἀνηγήσομαι. Greg. Nyss. de Vit. Greg. Thaum. Tom. iii. p. 537. D. vid. ib. A. B. C. et p. 536. D. ⁿ P. 538, 539.

^o Οὕτως καὶ ὁ μέγας ἄγιος διὰ πάσης ἡλθὼν τῆς τῶν ἑλλήνων παιδείας, καὶ γινῶς τῇ χειρὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς δογμάτων τὸ ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀσυστάτον, μαθητὴς τῇ εὐαγγελίῳ καθίσταται. p. 540. A. ^p Εἰς τὴν καὶ ἡ πάντα-

χοδὸν συνέρρει ποτὴς τῶν περὶ φιλοσοφίαν τῆ καὶ ιατρικῆν ἐσπούδακτων. p. 540. B.

^q p. 540, 541, 542. ^r Καὶ ἡ προτιτὸν ἀπικνὴ καταπνίγον αὐτὴν τὸ δαίμονιον, πρὶν ἢ τοῖς μέγαλιν ἐκείνῳ ἐπικαλεσασθαι τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἰλεῦσασθαι. p. 541. B.

^s καταλιπὼν πάσαις τῇ περὶ τῆς ἐξω φιλοσοφίας σπουδῇ, προσφοῖτα μετ' ἐκείνῳ τῷ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ἐκείνῳ τῆς τῶν χριστιανῶν φιλοσοφίας καθηγούμενῳ. Ὡριγενὴς δὲ υἱὸς ἦν, ὃ πολὺς ἐπὶ συγγράμμασι λόγος. p. 542. D.

His

His ordination was very remarkable, if not singular. Phedimus, bishop of Amafea, knowing the worth of this young man, and being grieved that a person of such accomplishments should live useless in the world, was desirous to consecrate him to God and his church. On the other hand, Gregory was shy of such a charge, and industriously concealed himself from the bishop of Amafea, whose design he was aware of. At length Phedimus, tired of his fruitless attempts to meet Gregory, and being blessed with the gift of foreknowledge, looking ^t up to God, to whom they were both present, instead of laying his hands upon Gregory, addressed a discourse to him, and consecrated him to God, though bodily absent; assigning him also a city, which till that time was so addicted to idolatry, that in it, and in all the country round about, there were not above seventeen believers.

Gregory was then at the distance of three days journey. Nyssen does not inform us how Gregory came to the knowledge of what had been done: however, he says, that now Gregory thought himself obliged to acquiesce; and that afterwards he was ordained with the usual ceremonies. He only desired ^u of him, by whom he had been ordained, a short time to prepare himself for the office to which he was appointed: nor ^w had he courage to undertake the work of preaching, till he had been informed of the truth by revelation. And, ^x whilst he was engaged in deep meditation, he had a magnificent and awful vision in his chamber: two persons appeared, one in the habit of a man, the other of a woman; encompassed also by a bright light, too strong for him to look upon directly. He heard these persons discourse together about the doctrines in which he desired to be informed: and he perceived who they were; for they called each other by name. The person in the habit of a woman desired, that John the evangelist would teach that young man the mystery of piety: and he replied, that he was not unwilling to do what was desired by the mother of our Lord. John then gave him the instruction he wanted; which, when they had disappeared, Gregory wrote down. According to that faith he always preached, and ^y left it with his church, as an invaluable treasure, a doctrine received from heaven: by which

^t p. 544. D. 545. A. ^u και βραχυ χρονον αιτησαμενος παρα τη την πρωστην επικηρυξαντος. κ. λ. p. 445. A. ^w και u περσιτοι επιταρασει τη τη λογη κηρυγματι, πριν δια τιος εμφανιας εκκαλυφθηναι αυτω την αληθειαν. ibid. B. ^x p. 545. C. D. 546. ^y Τοι δι παραχημα την θυσαν εκει-

την μυταγωγικαν γραμμασιν εισηγησασθαι, και κατ' εκεινην μετα ταυτα κερυσσειν εν τη εκκλησια τον λογον: και τοις ιφειξες, ωσπερ τινα κληρον την βιοσδοτον εκεινην διδασκαλιας καταλιπειν: δι' ης μυταγωγικαις μεχρι τη νυν ο εκεινος λαος, πασης αιρετικης κακιας διαμεινας απειρατος. p. 546. B. C.

means his people from that time to this were preserved pure from all heretical pravity. Nyssen then puts down the faith or creed which Gregory received from John; of which I shall speak more distinctly hereafter. And then he adds, 'If ^z any are desirous of farther satisfaction about this matter, let him inquire of the church, in which Gregory preached that doctrine, and with whom it is still preserved in the hand-writing of that blessed man.'

Gregory, being now well qualified for his work, both by a certain knowledge of the truth, and a sufficient degree of assurance, left ^a his solitude, and went directly toward the city that had been assigned him, and in which he was to form a church to God. As he was in his journey, being benighted, and overtaken by a violent storm, he and his friends with him were obliged to take shelter in a heathen temple. It was a temple of great fame, in which the dæmon who was there worshipped used to appear evidently to the priests, and deliver oracles. Gregory having gone away early in the morning, the priest performed the accustomed rites: but he was answered by the dæmon, that he could no more appear in that place, because of him that had lodged there the foregoing night. The priest, greatly enraged at hearing this, pursued Gregory; and, having overtaken him, threatened to inform the magistrates against him: but Gregory, not at all dismayed, told the priest, that he had such confidence in the power of the Being whom he served, that he not only relied upon his protection from men, but was also persuaded, that with his assistance he could expel dæmons from any place, and readmit them as he saw fit. And as a demonstration of such power, he took a slip of paper, and ^b wrote upon it, 'Gregory to Satan: Enter.' This paper being laid upon the altar, and the accustomed rites performed, the dæmon appeared as usual. The priest was now convinced that Gregory was guided by a power superior to dæmons: he therefore returned to him, relating what had happened, and desired to be farther instructed in the Christian religion. But some doubts still remaining, Gregory wrought another evident miracle: at his command ^c a large heavy stone lying before them moved, as if it had life, and settled again in the place Gregory directed. The priest was now fully satisfied; and, forsaking all things, wife, children, relations, his priesthood, home, and all his possessions, followed Gregory; esteem-

^z ὅτι οὐ φιλονικίαν τῶν πεισθῆναι, ἀκού-
ετω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐν ᾗ τοῦ λόγου ἐκφύττει,
παρ' οὗς αὐτὰ τὰ χαράγματα τῆς μακαρίας
ἐκκλησίας χεῖρες εἰς αὐτὴν καὶ νῦν διασώζονται. P.

547. A. ^a Ib. D. 548, 549. ^b Ἡ
δὲ τὰ γράμματα ἐκ' αὐτῆς τῆς λέξεως ταῦτα.
Γρηγόριος τῷ Σατανᾷ Εἰσελθεῖ. P. 549. C.
^c P. 550. A. B.

ing his company, and fellowship with him in his divine philosophy, instead of all other things. This priest ^d was afterwards one of Gregory's deacons.

The ^e fame of these great works out-went Gregory, so that the city was before-hand provided for his reception; and he entered in the midst of a vast crowd of people, who even came out to meet him with their wives and children. Gregory, as ^f Nyssen says, had before now disposed of all his estate, and at this time had nothing of his own; no land, no house, no habitation. His friends therefore, who accompanied him, were in pain for him; but he trusted in God; and when he entered the city he had many kind and pressing invitations made him. He took up his abode with one Musonius, a man of the greatest distinction in the city for his quality, estate and authority, and who had made the first offer of entertaining our young bishop. That very day, before sunset, he had made many converts. Early the next morning, men and women, of every rank and age in the city, were before the door of the house; and his success continued. Every one who had need of help was relieved, whether possessed with dæmons or afflicted with any bodily distemper; and all were admonished of the duties peculiarly suited to their age, relation, or station in life. He ^g preached, he argued, he persuaded, he healed.

The number of believers being greatly increased, in a short time he ^h formed a design of building a church, to which all readily contributed by their labour or their purses. Tillemont ⁱ observes, that this is no unlikely thing, the Christians enjoying all manner of liberty under Philip, who began his reign in the year 244. But, as he adds, this is the first church of which history gives us any certain and express information. This church, as ^k Nyssen says, was standing in his time: it must therefore have escaped the general demolition of churches in the Dioclesian persecution; as it did likewise a terrible earthquake afterwards, in which, as Nyssen ^l affirms, almost all the other buildings of the city, public and private, were overthrown.

Gregory being in great reputation for wisdom, abundance of people referred their differences to him, who readily acquiesced in his determinations. But ^m there were two brothers whom he could by no means reconcile. A certain lake was the matter in dispute. When they were about to decide the cause by arms, the

^d Vid. p. 569. D.

^e 551, 552. ^f *ibid.* ^g Καὶ ἐν με-
σαις ἐκείναις πρὸς τὴν ἐκάστην τῶν συνειληγμένων
χρῆται ἀρμόδιως τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος μα-
ριζομῆτος, κηρύσσων, συνεξιστάων, κούδων,

διδασκων, ἰατρικῶς. p. 553. D. ^h p. 554. B.

ⁱ S. Gregoire Thaumaturge. Art. vii.
Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 679. ^k p. 554.

A. B. ^l *ibid.* C. ^m p. 555, 556.

tenants of the two brothers fighting on each side, Gregory went to the lake the night before, and at his prayers it was dried up. The ^a river Lyc, or Lycus, often overflowing, to the great damage of the neighbouring country, at the desire of the people who suffered by those inundations, Gregory prescribed it proper limits, which it never passed afterwards.

Gregory Nyssen ^o then relates the story of our Gregory's remarkable ordination of Alexander, called the collier, at Comana. As Gregory was returning home from thence, two men agreed to put a trick upon him. One of them laid in the road as dead; the other begged of the bishop to give him somewhat to bury his poor companion. As Gregory passed by, he threw his cloak upon the pretended dead man. As soon as Gregory was out of sight, the other called to his companion to get up; but he had expired at the very instant Gregory cast his cloak upon him, which therefore now served for his burial cloth. Sozomen, ^p relating a like story concerning Epiphanius, recollects this also of Gregory, and he thinks they may be both true.

After his return to Neocæsarea, Gregory ^q cured a young man possessed of a dæmon: and ^r many people were delivered from dæmons, and relieved of their diseases, by only having pieces of linen brought to them, which had been breathed upon by him.

During the episcopate of Gregory, a ^s persecution of the Christians was ordered by imperial edicts, which was very severe in those parts. It is universally allowed that Nyssen means the Decian persecution, though he does not name the emperor. Gregory, ^t considering the weakness of human nature, advised his people, as many as could, to save themselves by flight: and, to remove all scruples, he gave them an example by retiring into a solitary place, taking with him the priest beforementioned, now his deacon. Here Gregory was sought for, but was miraculously preserved: for though his pursuers came to the place where he and his companion were, they did not see, or did not know them. In short, their eyes were so withheld, that they could see nothing but two trees. However, notwithstanding the forementioned good advice of Gregory, many ^u of his people were taken up, and imprisoned, and endured divers torments, and even death itself; he assisting them by his prayers, and by the counsel which he sent to them.

^a p. 558, 559, 560. ^o p. 561, 562.

^p Zozom. l. vii. cap. 27. ^q Nyssen.

p. 566. ^r ἀλλ' ἀρκούν πρὸς τὴν τῶν δαιμονίων ἀπαλλαγὴν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἰατρίαν τῶν ἀρ-

ρωγμάτων τῆς σωματικῆς τοῦ ἐκ τῆς στοματικῆς αὐτῆς ἀσθενίας διὰ τῆς ὁμοίας τῶν καμνοῦσι προσ-
αγομένων. p. 567. A.

^s p. 567, 568.

^t p. 569. C. D. ^u p. 570, 571, &c.

When the persecution was over, Gregory returned to Neocæsarea; and peace being restored to the church about the year 253, as may be supposed, he visited the several parts of his diocese, and ^w transferred the bodies of divers who had suffered martyrdom in the late persecution to several places at proper and convenient distances; where he appointed anniversary festivals and solemnities in memory of the martyrs, indulging the people upon those occasions a little more than ordinary mirth: which, says Nyssen, was wisely done; for many weak and ignorant people being fond of the heathen superstition, because of the diversions it allowed of, Gregory approved that people should be merry and divert themselves on the memorials of the martyrs; hoping by that means to bring them off from idolatry to the general principles of religion, and gradually to more complete virtue.

In some part of Gregory's episcopate the country of Pontus was afflicted with a fore and terrible plague. As Gregory ^x gave some intimations of it beforehand, and he was helpful to many, not only by the charitable relief he afforded, but ^y likewise by the miraculous cures he wrought, great numbers were brought to the profession of Christianity at that season. In a word, when ^z this bishop was near his death, reflecting upon his labours, and hearing there were still seventeen unbelievers in that country, it gave him no small concern: however, he thought it matter of much joy and thanksgiving, that he left his successor no more idolaters than he had found Christians.

This is the account which Gregory of Nyssa has given of his namesake of Neocæsarea; upon which many remarks might be made. It is plain it is a panegyric, not a history. Nyssen is so intent upon the marvellous, that he has scarce any regard to common things: he relates distinctly the mysterious faith which Gregory received one night from John the evangelist; but he dispatches in a very few words the instructions which Gregory received from Origen; though he was five years under his tuition, and had before him excellent materials to enlarge upon concerning that part of our bishop's history. Then he takes little or no notice of circumstances of time and place, or the names of persons; these he omits as things of no moment. Indeed he has been so good as to inform us of Gregory's native city and country, and that he studied some while, as he says, at Alexandria: but he does not let us know where Gregory was

^w Τας υπερ των ενθληκων τη ημερι πανηγυρις νομοθετησας. και διαλαβοντες αλλως ζοντες.. p. 574. A. B. ^x p. 576.
^y p. 577. ^z p. 574. D. 575. A.
αλλαγη των μαρτυρων τα σωματα, κατα την ετησιον τη ενιαυσιαυ κηλη περιουσι συνιστης

acquainted with Origen; whether at Alexandria, or at Cæsarea. He has not once named the city where Gregory was bishop: and in the description of Gregory's arrival in the city assigned him, and where he was to reside, there is no notice taken that it was his native place: nay, one might be almost apt to think he was an absolute stranger there, and unknown to every body. He does not inform us of the temple where Gregory lodged and silenced the dæmon; neither where it stood, nor to what god it was dedicated. He has not so much as once mentioned the name of the priest who was converted in so extraordinary a manner; who, so far as appears, was our bishop's first convert, and was afterwards a deacon of the church. Nor has he mentioned the name of any one of the many persons, subjects of Gregory's miraculous works. However, it should be owned that he has not concealed the name of the river, whose inundations are said to have been restrained by this mighty man. As before observed, he omits the name of the emperor, author of the persecution that was so severe, and which was so remarkable for Gregory's flight and preservation, and many glorious martyrdoms. Finally, perhaps it may be reckoned by some an inexcusable defect, that in this long oration not any the least notice is taken of Athenodorus, Gregory's brother, and the companion of his travels and studies and conversion to the faith, and afterwards bishop likewise in the same country of Pontus. All these omissions seem unaccountable.

Possibly it will be said, that it was contrary to the rules of rhetoric to be more particular in an oration. If that be so, and all that Nyssen aimed at was to entertain his hearers or readers with a fine piece of oratory, we must consider it as such: but then, though it may afford us some good entertainment, it will hardly be a ground of much faith: for a story to be amusing is one thing, to be credible another.

Farther, the relations of most of the miracles are liable to some other exceptions. The story of the woman at Alexandria is trifling and unlikely. Nay, ^a Basnage says, Gregory never studied at Alexandria. And he may be in the right as to this, so far as I know: then this is a mere fiction, as the same learned writer argues. The moving of the stone at the command of Gregory is silly and romantic, or at least vain and insignificant, and therefore also improbable. The silencing the dæmon by a message sent in writing must surely appear absurd, though it should be

^a Quæ igitur de meretrice Alexandriæ, quæ sese cum Gregorio consuescere simulavit, et numerata sorto pecunia, et dæmone in fauces ejus involante, narran-

tur, lepidæ sunt fabulæ, quæ fractis illabentis Alexandrinæ protectionis rudibus obruuntur. *Basn. Ann. 240, iv.*

allowed to be referred to by some other (n) writers. Besides, Gregory leaves Satan in possession of the temple, which I think was not well done, if he was able to send him away : and this continuance of Satan at the temple confutes the former account ; it seems to shew it to be a mere fiction. If Gregory had once dispossessed Satan, he would not have allowed him to resume and keep possession afterwards. Basnage, though he does not dispute every thing related by Nyssen, greatly dislikes this ^b story.

I do not intend to deny, that Gregory wrought miracles ; for I suppose he did, as I shall acknowledge more particularly by and by : nevertheless, there is no harm in making these remarks, if they are just ; or in shewing that Nyssen's relations are defective, and want some tokens of credibility, with which we should have been mightily pleased.

As for what he says of Gregory's appointing anniversary festivals and solemnities in honour of the martyrs that had suffered in his diocese, and allowing people upon those occasions some unusual mirth and rejoicings, I am sure this is no apostolical method of making conversions ; nor was it practised in the most primitive times next after the apostles : and I am not satisfied of the truth of what Nyssen says. As I am unwilling to lay hold of every thing he writes to advance this bishop's honour, so neither do I take this particular upon his credit, which tends to diminish that honourable idea I am willing to have of him, and for which I think I have good ground. This childish method of making converts appears unworthy of so wise and good a man as Gregory. Nor is it likely that those festivals should be instituted by one who had the gift of miracles, and therefore a much better way of bringing men to religion and virtue.

We have now perused the summary of Gregory's life in Jerom : the history of the early part of his life we have had from himself ; and Gregory of Nyssa has afforded us an entertaining account of this great man from the beginning to the time of his death.

II. Gregory is mentioned by many ancient writers. I shall here add some of their passages ; they may be considered as tes-

(n) Socrates certainly refers to it. L. iv. cap. 27. And Basil is thought to do so likewise, when he says, Gregory had a power terrible to *dæmons*: ος φοβερον μιν αυτην εν της τε ανιματος συνεργασια κατα δαμονων το χρατος. De Sp. S. cap. 29. v. 61. D. But here the reference to this matter is not clear and certain. Basil might intend some of Gregory's miracles, dispossessing *dæmons* out of the bodies of

men. ^b Fidem tamen a nobis non impetrat festiva Nysseni narratio. Nempe quod *dæmoni*, quem tem loquax euleraat, cogatus a sacerdote, ut rursus in eam suam exilem introduceret, in exiguo libri frustulo scribitur: Gregorius Satanae ; Intra. Quæ licentia vix absque peccato dari potuit, neque vel ad eam concedendam, missa ad diabolum ista opus fuit. Quod sane mirum est scribendi genus, ac indig-

timonies. The writers I shall cite are, Origen, Eusebius, Jerom again, Basil, Theodoret, and Socrates; omitting some others, as not so material witnesses, and for avoiding too great prolixity.

Origen, in his letter to Gregory, probably written not many months after his return home, tells him, 'his^c capacity was such, that he might be either a Roman lawyer of the first rank, 'or a celebrated Greek philosopher.' But he adviseth him to make the Christian religion his chief study.

Eusebius, speaking of Origen's scholars, says, 'The^d most noted of them were Theodore, called also Gregory, the most renowned bishop of our time, and his brother Athenodorus; 'whom when Origen observed to be too fond of Greek and Roman learning, instilling into them a love of philosophy, he drew them off from their former studies to divine things. 'Having stayed with him five whole years, they made such progress in the knowledge of the divine oracles, that whilst they were yet very young they were both appointed bishops in Pontus.' In another place, relating things under Gallienus, about the year 260, he says, 'At^e that time Gregory and his brother 'Athenodorus governed the churches in Pontus.' And among the bishops assembled from several parts in the first council at Antioch in 264, 'The most considerable,' he^f says, 'were Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the two brothers 'Gregory and Athenodorus, pastors of the churches in Pontus, 'Helenus of Tarsus, and some others.'

Jerom, in his letter to Magnus, so often cited already, among other eminent Christian authors, mentions^g Theodore, afterwards named Gregory, and calls him a man of apostolical signs and wonders.

What Basil, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, has written of our Gregory may deserve some special notice.

In his Treatise of the Holy Spirit, after having mentioned divers ancient ecclesiastical writers of chief note; such as Irenæus, Dionysius of Rome, and him of Alexandria, Origen, Africanus, and others; he adds; 'But^h where shall I place the 'great Gregory, and his words? Ought he not to be ranked 'with the apostles and prophets; a man who walked in the same

nissimum viro sancto commercium. Basil. A. 240. vi. ^c Διατάται δι' η ευφροια σιν Ρωμαιοι σιν νομικον ποιουν τελειοι, και Ελληνικοι τινα φιλοσοφοι των νομιζομενων ελλογιμων αριστων. Orig. Ep. ad Greg. T. i. p. 30. D. Bened. ^d ου επισημης μαλιστα γνωμιαι Θεοδωρου, . . . ες ην αυτος ητος ο καθ' ημας επισκοπος διαβου- τας Γρηγοριος, κ. λ. H. E. L. vi. cap. 30.

^e l. vii. cap. 14. ^f ib. c. 28. ^g Exstant et Julii Africani libri, qui temporum scrip- sit historias; et Theodori, qui postea Gre- gorius appellatus est, viri apostolicorum signorum atque virtutum. Hieron. ep. 83. [al. 84.] p. 656 m. ^h Basil. De Sp. S. cap. 29. T. iii. p. 62, 63. Bened.

‘ spirit with them, who always followed the footsteps of the
 ‘ saints, and in the whole of his conduct was a complete model
 ‘ of the evangelical life? 2 Cor. xii. 18. For my part, I must
 ‘ say, we should be injurious to the truth, if we do not reckon
 ‘ that soul in the number of those who were dearest to God,
 ‘ who shined in the church as a large burning lamp, who by the
 ‘ mighty operation of the spirit had a power terrible to dæmons,
 ‘ who received such grace of the word *for the obedience of faith*
 ‘ *among all nations*, (Rom. i. 5.) that though at first he found only
 ‘ seventeen Christians, he brought over to the acknowledgment
 ‘ of God all the people both of the city and the neighbouring
 ‘ country. He also turned the course of rivers, commanding
 ‘ them in the all-powerful name of Christ; and dried up a lake,
 ‘ which was the subject of contention between covetous brothers.
 ‘ His predictions of things future are such, as not to be inferior
 ‘ to those of other prophets. But it would be too long to reckon
 ‘ up all the miracles of this person, who for the abundance of
 ‘ the gifts wrought in him by the Holy Spirit, *in all power*, [or,
 ‘ mighty deeds] *signs and wonders*, (2 Cor. xii. 12.) was called a
 ‘ second Moses by the enemies of the truth. Such was the grace
 ‘ of all his words and actions, that he appeared to be adorned
 ‘ with a peculiar light and splendour, an indication of the hea-
 ‘ venly power by which he was conducted. He is still the ad-
 ‘ miration of all the people of that country; and the memory of
 ‘ him is ever fresh and lively in the churches, not at all abated
 ‘ by length of time; for ⁱ which reason they have not taken up
 ‘ any custom, word, or mystical rite, beside what they received
 ‘ from him. Infomuch, that that church appears defective in
 ‘ many respects, because they have nothing but what is ancient;
 ‘ for they who have succeeded him in the government of the
 ‘ churches would admit of none of those things that have been
 ‘ since invented, but have kept entirely to the first institutions,
 ‘ as derived from him.’

This is the great character which Basil gives of Gregory, and
 this is what he says here of his people. Nevertheless, this church
 of Neocæsarea, the people of Gregory, were very troublesome to
 the same Basil, or he gave himself a great deal of trouble and un-
 easiness about them; for in divers of his letters he complains that
 they were all Sabellians; and he laments the strange aversion they

ⁱ ἢ καὶ ἡ πρᾶξις τινα, οὐ λόγος, ἢ τυπὸς καὶ, διὰ τὸ τῆς κατὰ γὰρ τῆς ἀρχαίας ἀρετῆς. οὐ-
 τινα μυστικὸν παρ’ οὐκ ἐκείνους κατέλιπε, τῇ ἐκ-
 κλησίᾳ προσέθηκεν. Ταῦτα τοὶ καὶ πολλὰ κλησίας οἰκουμένησιν, τῶν μετ’ ἐκείνου ἐφεν-
 τῶν παρ’ αὐτοὺς τελευτήτων ἁλλοιωσὶς ἔχουσιν δο-
 ρισθέντων παραδείξασθαι εἰς προσθήκην. ib. p. 63.

had for him; which appears to have been general in the bishop, clergy, people, and even the near relations of Basil in that church.

In a letter to the Neocæsareans, written about the year 375, entreating their good will and reconciliation to him, he says, 'That ^k one thing which should unite them in affection is, that he and they had the same instructors in the mysteries of religion, and the same spiritual fathers: I mean, says he, the great and admirable Gregory, and those who have succeeded him in the episcopal chair with you, as stars arising one after another, all walking in the same steps, leaving to all who are disposed to attend manifest traces of an heavenly conversation.' Afterwards, in the same letter, 'And ^l what stronger proof can there be of [the orthodoxy of] our faith, than that we were educated by our grandmother, that blessed woman sprung from among you? I mean the celebrated Macrina, by whom we were taught the words of the most blessed Gregory, as she had received them and preserved them in her memory, when she taught us in our childhood the principles of religion and virtue.'

In another letter written to the clergy of Neocæsarea, after complaining of their ^m universal agreement with their bishop in an opposition against him, he writes, 'Do ⁿ not follow those who introduce among you impious doctrines; nor do you sit still whilst in your sight the people of God is subverted by corrupt principles. Sabellius, an African, and Marcellus of Galatia, are the only persons that have taught and written those things, which some leading men among you now produce as inventions of their own; talking, indeed, with much assurance, but bringing no plausible arguments for what they say. These men reproach us without any regard to truth, but will not come to discourse with us. . . . Yea they are arrived at such impudence as ^o to calumniate our doctrine as pernicious.' He goes on: 'And ^p what is the ground of this implacable hatred of me? They say that I have introduced psalms and a method of singing different from your custom; and other such like things they say, which

A. B. ^k Εἰ. 2. 4. [al. 75.] p. 303. C. D. *ibid.* ^l Περὶ τῆς μητέρας, τῆς ἀν

γιοῦτο παργιστρα ἀποδείξει, ἡ ὅτι τραφέντες ἡμεῖς ὑποτίθῃ μακαρία γυναῖκα, πατρὸς ἡμεῶν ὡμῆμιν; Μακρίνας λέγου τὴν περιβόητον, πατρὸς ἡμῶν εἰδὼς ἔχοντα τὰ μακαριώτατα Γρηγορίου ῥήματα, ὅσα πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀκολουθία μνημῆς διασώθεντα αὐτὴ τὴν ἐφύλασσε, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ ἡλικίας ὄντας ἐπλάττει καὶ ἐμορφῶ τοῖς τῆς εὐσεβείας δόγμασιν. p. 306. B.

^m Ἡ μὲν συμφωνία τῶν καθ' ἡμῶν μῦθων, καὶ το μὲν ἵκναι πάντας ἀκολουθεῖν τῶν προειρητω

των καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμων, κ. λ. Ερ. 207. [al. 63.] p. 309. D. ⁿ *Ibid.* E. ^o διαβαλλόντες ἡμῶν τὰς διδασκαλίας, ὡς βλαβεράς. *ibid.*

p. 310. B. ^p Καὶ τῆς αἰτίας ἐμὴς ἐμὴς τὴν ἀκρυκτὴν τὴν καὶ ἀσώτον πολέμῳ, ψαλμῶν λέγουσι καὶ τροπῶν μελωδίας, τῆς πατρὸς ἡμῶν κειρατῆρας συνθεῖας παρηλλαγμένους, καὶ τοιαῦτα τινὰ, ἐφ' οἷς ἐχρην αὐτοὶς ἐγκαλῆσαι. Εὐχαριστοῦμεν δὲ, ὅτι καὶ αὐθιγῶς ἔχουμεν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀσκήτας, ἀποταξάμενοι τῶν κόσμων, καὶ πασαις ταῖς βίαις καὶς μεμνημένους. κ. λ. *ib.* p. 310. C.

' they

‘ they might be ashamed to mention. We are likewise accused
 ‘ that we have among us men who *exercise themselves unto godliness*,
 ‘ who have renounced the world and all earthly cares, which the
 ‘ Lord compares to *briars and thorns, which suffer not the word to*
 ‘ *bring forth fruit to perfection*; men, who bear about the *dying of Jesus*
 ‘ *in their body, and take up the cross, and follow God.*’ 1 Tim. iv. 7.
 Matt. xiii. 22. Luke viii. 14. 2 Cor. iv. 10. Matt. xvi. 24.
 Basil adds, he hears there are already such men in Egypt, and per-
 haps likewise in Palestine and in Mesopotamia, and more than in
 his diocese. ‘ Moreover,’ says he, ‘ if some women, chusing an
 ‘ evangelical life, prefer virginity to marriage, bringing into sub-
 ‘ jection the desires of the flesh, practising that *mourning* on which
 ‘ a blessing is pronounced; (Matt. v. 4.) blessed are they for this their
 ‘ purpose, in whatever part of the world they are. . . . For I
 ‘ would have you to know that we glory in this, that we have so-
 ‘ cieties of men and women whose *conversation is in heaven*, (Philip.
 ‘ iii. 20.) who *have crucified the flesh with it’s affections and lusts*,
 ‘ (Gal. v. 24.) who are not solicitous about meat and dress, but are
 ‘ *without distraction*, (1 Cor. vii. 35.) and constantly attend on the
 ‘ Lord, and *continue in supplications night and day*, (1 Tim. v. 5.) whose
 ‘ mouth speaketh not the works of men, but they sing hymns to
 ‘ our God without ceasing, *working with their own hands, that they*
 ‘ *may give to him that needeth*,’ (Eph. iv. 28.) Then he returns to the
 charge brought against him for the new psalmody, by which espe-
 cially, as he says, they terrified the more simple people, and ex-
 asperated them against him. Here Basil describes that new way
 of singing which gave offence, and then goes on again: ‘ But
 ‘ these things, they say, were not in the time of the great Gregory.
 ‘ To which I answer, Nor yet the litanies [penitential prayers]
 ‘ you make use of: not that I blame you for that, for I could
 ‘ wish that you all lived in tears and in continued penance. . . .
 ‘ But after all,’ says Basil, ‘ you retain nothing of Gregory; for
 ‘ he did not pray with his head covered. . . . He did not swear.
 ‘ . . . He did not call his brother fool. . . . He did not come to
 ‘ the altar before he had been reconciled to his brother.’ Thus
 Basil goes on, giving these men hard words, when perhaps the
 same, or like things, might be said too truly of Basil’s own friends
 and admirers, or any other people; especially if a man is out of
 humour with them because they do not submit to his will and

ἡ γυναικὶν δὲ ὑμᾶς βελομαι, ὅτι ἡμεῖς εὐχο- τὴν ἀπλῆτην φοβέσθαι οἱ διαβαλλόντες
 μέθα, καὶ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν σιγήματα ἡμᾶς. p. 311. A. Ἄλλ’ ἔκ κ’ ἐν, φρεσὶ,
 ἔχουσιν. κ. λ. p. 310. E. 311. A. Πρὸς ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῷ μεγάλῳ Γρηγορίῳ. p. 311. D.
 οἱ τοὶ ἐν ψαλμοῖς ἐγκλημα, ἢ μάλιστα ὁ Γρηγόριος ἢ κατεκαλυπτότο ἐπὶ τῶν προσευ-

pleasure. 'But,' says ^u he, 'we forgive every thing; only let the great things of religion be preserved: let there not be any innovations made in the faith: do not overthrow the subsistences, [hypostases:] do not deny the name of Christ: do not misinterpret the words of Gregory.'

From these several passages I think it appears, that Gregory's church at Neocæsarea were now an old-fashioned people, Christians of the primitive sort. There were some new hymns, or psalms, begun to be made use of by others which they did not approve of. They likewise disliked the new psalmody, which was a more artificial way of singing than was heretofore in use in the churches of Christ. Monasteries of men and women were another innovation which gave them offence: and when it is considered that Basil was fond of all these things, particularly of monasteries, and was the ^w first person who introduced them into the countries of Cappadocia and Pontus, some will be able to account for the angry and contemptuous treatment which Basil gives the Neocæsareans. The opposition which those good people made to his new schemes was, it seems, a high provocation. But some may think that those Christians had good reason to oppose some of his measures and take offence at them; and not a few persons of good judgment may still be displeased when they observe how he debaseth the sublime sense of many texts, and perverts the scriptures in support of his monastic institutions.

Basil says, that the Neocæsareans then had litanies, or penitential prayers, not used in Gregory's time; and insinuates, that they prayed with their heads covered. What they would say for themselves with regard to these two points, I cannot tell; but as for their doctrine about the hypostases, or subsistences, it is plain from Basil, that they defended their sentiment out of Gregory's writings. What Basil says of their having nothing of Gregory left among them, is extravagant. He has himself bore them this testimony, that they had a vast respect for the founder of their church; and that they were so shy of admitting later inventions, that they appeared defective and antiquated, in comparison of many other churches of that age.

We must make extracts out of another letter of Basil, written to the chief men of Neocæsarea. Basil was then at a place in the neighbourhood of that city: his coming so near them put the whole city into confusion: to abate their resentments, he reminds

χων. *ibid.* E. ^u Μοινοῖς ἐρρωσθαι τὰ προη- τοιοῦμα τῇ Χριστῇ μὴ ἀπαρνησθὶ τὰς τῇ
 γήμιν, καὶ τὰς περὶ τῆς πίστεως καινοτομίας. Γρηγορίου φωνὰς μὴ παρεξηγεῖσθαι. *ib.* p. 312.
 κατασπύλασθαι τὰς υποτάξεις μὴ ἀντιτεῖναι. C. ^w *Vid. Vit. St. Basil, cap. vi. num.*

them of his education * by his grandmother, in that very place, and assures them, that he came thither now for retirement. He reminds them also of the respect they formerly had for him, when their whole city invited him and pressed him with much earnestness and importunity to undertake the education of their youth. 'But,' says he, 'I will tell you what is the ground of this animosity against me, which prevails to such a degree in your city. It is no other than this: there is among you a design to overthrow the faith, in opposition to the apostolical and evangelical doctrine, and the tradition of the truly great Gregory, and all his successors to the blessed Musonius, whose words must still sound in your ears. For the heresy of Sabellius; which some now endeavour to revive, was formerly extinguished by the tradition of that great man. . . . Sabellianism * is Judaism, brought into the church under the name of Christianity. . . . These men pretend, in a letter to Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, who is of the same mind with us, that Gregory says, in his Exposition of the Faith, that the Father and Son are two in our conception, but one in hypostasis. These acute and subtle people, it seems, cannot see that that is not spoken dogmatically, [or as a point of doctrine;] but agonistically, [or, in the haste and fervour of disputation] in his conference with Ælian; in which too there are many faults of the transcribers, as I will shew, if God permit. Besides, teaching a Gentile, he did not think it necessary to be accurate in his expressions; for it was fit to yield a little to a man that was to be brought over to the faith, that he might not reject the chief things: insomuch, that you may find there several words which afford the greatest advantage to the heretics of this time; such as creature, made, and the like.'

Thus writes Basil. Certainly this is a slight apology: no one can think that Gregory owes any thanks to the author of it. However, let us make a few remarks.

i. p. 53. B. C. D. Bened. * ενταυθα γαρ ιεραφην παρα τη εμαυτη τιτθη. Ep. 110. al. 64. p. 313. D. γ Πιστως διαγραφη παρ υμων μελεταται, ιχθρα μεν τοις απογο- λικαις και ευαγγελικαις δογμασιν, ιχθρα δε τη παραδοσει τη μεγαλη ως αληθως Γρηγοριου, και των ιφεξης απ' εκεινη, μεχρι τη μακαριου Μουσωνιου η τα διδαγματα εναντα υμων εστιν ετι και νυν δηλοσοτι. το γαρ Σαβελλιου κακου, παλαι μεν κινθην, κατασβεισθην δε τη παρα- δοσει τη μεγαλη επιχειρησι νυν ανακησθαι ετοι. p. 314. D. E. * p. 315. A. Καθηκον δε τισα πειραν δι' επιτολης, και προς τον ομοψυχον ημων Α'ιδιμον των Τυανων επισ-

κοποι' ως αρα Γρηγοριου ειποντος εν εκδισει πιστως, πατερα και υιον επινοια μεν ειναι δυο, υποτασιν δε εν. Τυτο δε οτι η δογματικως ειρη- ται, αλλ' αγωνιστικως, εν τη προς Αιδιανον δια- λεξει, εκ ηδωκησσαν συνδειν οι επι λιπτοτητι των φρεων ιαυτης μακαριζοις' εν η πολλα των απογραφασμενων εστι σφαλματα, ως επ' αυτων των λεξων διζομεν ημεις, εαν ο Θεος θελη. Επειτα, μεντοι τον Ελληνα παιδον, ηε ηγνιτο χρεια ακριβολογησθαι περι τα ρημα- τα' αλλ' εστιν οση και συνδιδουαι τη ιδει τη επαγομενη, ως αν μη αντιστοιχοι προς τα καιρια. Διο δε και πολλας αν ευροις εκει φωνας, τας εν τοις αιρετικαις μεγαλην ιχυν παρεχομενας'

1. Basil says, the people of Neocæsarea had been taught the right faith by all their bishops down to Musonius; whose successor therefore, their present bishop, was the first person who taught among them the doctrine which Basil dislikes: and Basil here says fine things of that Musonius, and calls him a blessed man, now he was dead and gone; but when he was living Basil did not agree with him; no better, perhaps, than with his successor, the present bishop. That they differed to a great degree Basil owns in a letter^b written soon after the death of Musonius; though he says it was not about doctrinals that they differed, but only about some matters relating to the discipline or peace of the churches.

In that letter, which is a consolatory epistle to the Neocæsareans upon occasion of the death of their pastor, and written six or seven years before this, he gives such an account of Musonius that I cannot forbear inserting it in this place. He says, 'he was an ornament of the churches, a pillar and ground of the truth, a support of the faith which is in Christ Jesus, (1 Tim. iii. 15. Col. ii. 5.) an enemy of all novelty; shewing in himself a pattern of the primitive constitution of the church, so that they who conversed with him might imagine to themselves that they saw one of the lights that shined two hundred years ago and more.' This is a most glorious character! Heu pietas, heu prisca fides! If Musonius was such a man, how can it be for Basil's honour to have disagreed with him? May there not be some reason to apprehend that, by this commendation of another, Basil has passed a censure upon himself, who seems to have countenanced all the innovations of the times?

2. Basil says, the heresy of Sabellius had been extinguished by the tradition of Gregory: but what is meant by this I do not know. Gregory was at the first council against Paul at Antioch, but Paul was not then deposed; nor was Gregory at the second council. Besides, by his tradition, I guess to be intended not Gregory himself, whilst living, but rather his doctrine after his death. But what Basil refers to in that expression I cannot say.

3. Basil does not deny that Gregory used the words alleged by the Neocæsareans.

4. Basil labours extremely in the rest of his answer. Since the passage insisted upon is genuine, what does it avail to say, there

ως το κτισμα, και το ποιημα, και η τι τοις-
τον. *ibid.* p. 316. C. D. ^b Τετο δε ει-
διναι υμας βελομεθα, οτι ει και προς της ει-
ρηνης των εκκλησιων συστριχοντα ημιν εκ ειχο-
μεν τον μακαριον . . . αλλ' ου γι της προς αυ-
του ομοδοξιας, και τε αι κοινωνον επικαλεισ-
βαι των προς της αιρετικης αγωγων, . . . υδινα

καιρον απεισιφθην. Ep. 28. [al. 62.] p.
108. E. ^c . . . πατεροποιας ιχθρος' η
εαυτη διικνυς το παλαιον της εκκλησιας σχη-
μα, οιοι απο τιος προπριτης εικονος, της αρ-
χαιας καταστασιως, το ειδος της υπ' αυτου
εκκλησιας διαμορφων' ωστε της αυτη συγγι-
νετης, τοις προ διακοσιων ετων και επτακισ-
αυτ

are faults of transcribers, perhaps in things of little moment only? Then he owns that Gregory spoke inaccurately, at least in his judgment: nay, he makes Gregory disguise or conceal the truth, and thus cast a mist before an honest heathen, in order to make a profelyte of him. This is not defending Gregory, but abusing him: that the Neocæsareans may be confuted, Gregory is vilified.

5. As for the doctrine now held by the Neocæsareans, whether downright Sabellianism, or somewhat differing from it; I think that, considering the passages before alleged, and the great respect they had for Gregory, it seems probable that there must have been some grounds in his writings for the doctrine which now obtained among them. It is not easy to suppose that a sentiment entirely different from Gregory's, in a point of importance, should universally prevail in a church that greatly respected his memory; who were averse to novelty in all other matters, and had been all along blessed with bishops, who were great admirers of antiquity, and tenacious of ancient doctrines and customs.

We have now seen Basil's passages relating to our bishop, and have made some remarks upon them.

Theodoret, who flourished about the year 423, speaking of the council of Antioch in 264, says, 'They^d of the first rank among those who assembled there were, Gregory the great, the renowned, who by the indwelling grace of the Spirit performed those wonderful works which are celebrated by all mankind; his brother, Athenodorus; Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Capadocia, an illustrious person, equally master of divine and human knowledge; and Helenus, who presided in the metropolis of the Cilicians,' meaning Tarsus.

Socrates, who flourished before the middle of the fifth century, speaks of our Gregory after this manner: That^e he was born at Neocæsarea, and that to his time Gregory was famous at Athens, and Berytus, and in all Pontus, and, in a word, all over the world. Having been some while at Athens, he went to Berytus for the sake of the law. Being informed that Origen explained the sacred scriptures at Cæsarea, he went immediately thither; and, giving over the study of the Roman laws, became a disciple of Origen. Having learned of him the true philosophy, he returned home at the desire of his parents. 'There^f he did many mira-

ἑωστέρας τροπῶν ἐκλαμψασι συγγενικαὶ
ἐσκεν. i. id. p. 106. D. ^d τῶν δὲ συνε-
ληλυθότων ἐπρωτεύον γρηγόριος τὴν ὁ μέγας, ὁ
περιβρῆλτος, ὁ τὰς παρὰ πάντων ἀδοκίμας
θαυματοργίας ἐπιτείλας διὰ τῆς ἐνοικησῆς
τῆ πνεύματος χάριτος. . . . Hæg. Fab. l. 2.

c. 8. ^e Socr. l. 4. c. 27. ^f καὶ
πρῶτον μὲν λαϊκὸς ὢν, πολλὰ σημεῖα ἐποίησεν,
νοσηντὰς θεραπεύων, καὶ δαιμονίας δι' ἐπιστο-
λῶν φυγαδεύων, καὶ τῆς ἀλλοτρίου, τοῖς τε
λογίοις, καὶ πλεον τοῖς γινόμενοις ὑπ' αὐτὴν προσ-
αγομένους. ibid. p. 244. C.

cles, even (E) whilst he was yet a layman, healing the sick, and driving away dæmons by his letters. He converted many Gentiles by his discourses, and yet more by his works. Pamphilus the martyr makes mention of him in his Apology for Origen; to which he added Gregory's farewell oration, spoken in praise of Origen.

III. These I suppose to be the most valuable, as well as most ancient, accounts of our author. We will now, so far as we are able, collect from them his age, and some other particulars, which have not been so distinctly expressed by the ancients as might be wished.

Dr. Cave, in his *Historia Literaria*,^s placeth Gregory at the year 254; but for what reason he has set him so late I do not know, when he usually placeth ecclesiastical writers, if they are bishops, about the time they were ordained; and he supposeth that Gregory was a bishop before the Decian persecution. He digests the history of Gregory in this order: after the rudiments of learning received at home, he went to Alexandria; thence to Athens; afterwards to Berytus; and at last, about the year 234, he came with his brother Athenodorus to Origen at Cæsarea in Palestine, where he stayed five years; having been at the council of Antioch in 265, he died the same year.

Du Pin^h says, Gregory was ordained about the year of Christ 240: that having been present at the first council in the affair of Paul of Samosata, he died a short time after, in the year 265.

Basnageⁱ thinks that Gregory came to Cæsarea in 231, the same year that Origen arrived there from Alexandria: that he took his leave of Origen in the year 235, at the beginning of the persecution under the emperor Maximinus, having been with Origen five years, the first and last years both incomplete. It is true, Eusebius says, that Gregory and his brother were^k five whole years with Origen: nevertheless, Basnage thinks those years may be understood as just now explained. He farther^l argues, that Gregory did not study at all at Athens, nor Berytus, nor Alexandria; but only at Cæsarea, whither he came directly

(E) even whilst he was yet a layman.] I have translated agreeably to Valesius, whose words are: *Ubi primo quidem, dum adhuc laicus esset, multa fecit miracula, &c.* But I would propose that the Greek should be rendered thus: And there, having been first for some while a layman, he wrought many miracles, healing the sick, and driving away dæmons by his letters, and converting Gentiles by his words, but more especially by his works. If the words are so understood,

Socrates agrees with Gregory of Nyssa, and likewise with Jerom in his Catalogue. See above p. 26. According to this sense Valesius's version may be amended with only a small alteration in this manner: *Ubi, quum aliquandiu laicus fuisset, multa fecit miracula, &c.* ^s Part i. p. 93. ^h Nouv. Bib. St. Greg. Thaumaturge. ⁱ Basn. Ann. 240. n. iii. ^k *ἑνὶ καὶ ὅλοις ἐτεσιν αὐτῷ συγγενομένοις.* Euf. l. vi. c. 30. p. 230. A. ^l Basn. ib. n. iii. iv. v.

from his native country: from which place also he returned home, according to Gregory's own history of himself in the panegyric oration; which, as that learned writer supposeth, confutes the stories of all the other journies. He says Gregory was ordained in 240, and died in 265.

Tillemont^m supposeth, that Gregory came to Origen at Cæsarea in 231: that in 235, Origen being obliged to retire, upon occasion of the persecution under Maximinus, Gregory took that opportunity to go to Alexandria, where he was in 235, 236, and 237; and, returning thence to Cæsarea, he completed his five years with Origen, or made up eight years from the time he first came to him, and then left him to go home in 239; and^a Fabricius appears to approve of this method of removing the difficulties relating to this matter. As for the time when Gregory was made bishop, Tillemont thinks it not easy to be determined: all that we can find, says^o he, is, that Gregory left Origen in 238 or 239, and that Nyssen gives us ground to think he had laboured a good deal, when his church was tried by the Decian persecution in 250; and^p he observes, that^q Baronius computes the death of Gregory to have happened soon after the first council relating to Paul, for no other reason but this, that we have no particular account of him after that; whereas the modern Greeks say, he lived and flourished under Aurelian, who did not begin his reign till 270: and, adds Tillemont, perhaps we ought to read Aurelian in Suidas, where the printed editions of that author say Gregory died under Julian. This may be reckoned a happy conjecture; for Kuster says, that two manuscript copies of Suidas have Aurelian in that place instead of Julian, which manuscripts he has followed in his edition. And Fabricius^r declares it to be his opinion, that Gregory died in the time of Aurelian, not before the year 270. However, Pagi^s gives it as his judgment, that Baronius was in the right to conclude that Gregory died soon after the forementioned council, since his attendance there is the last thing we hear of him.

Such are the opinions of learned moderns, very skilful in these matters; and though these things may appear to some of no importance, I must own I should be glad to settle the time of this great man, or come near it, upon probable grounds. As for Gregory's journey to Athens, it is mentioned by Socrates only, who makes many mistakes in what he says of this writer; as all may

^m Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. St. Greg. Art. vi. P. 675. ^p Ibid. Art. xi. p. Thaum. Art. iv. p. 669, et note (i) p. 903, 691. ^q Baron. Ann. 166. n. xiv. &c. ^a Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 247. ^o Ibid. ^r Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 248. ^s Pagi

perceive from what has been taken from others, without our staying here to shew those mistakes distinctly. Therefore I think there is no reason to suppose that Gregory ever studied in that city. The journey to Alexandria likewise I could willingly set aside with Basnage; for neither Eusebius nor Jerom make any mention of it. It seems to have been put down by Nyssen without any ground. But Alexandria was a flourishing city, and much resorted to. It cost him little or no labour to send Gregory thither, and tell a strange adventure or two of him whilst there; or perhaps Nyssen thought Origen was still at Alexandria; though if he did he was plainly mistaken, it being very evident from Gregory's Oration, that Origen was settled at Cæsaria before he became acquainted with him: but as for the journey to Berytus, methinks there is somewhat to be said for it; because it is particularly mentioned by Jerom, and Socrates, and Suidas; though it must be owned, that this last only transcribes Sophronius's Greek translation of Jerom's Catalogue. It is true likewise, that Gregory in his Oration affords us no authority for this supposition. Nevertheless, perhaps this opinion is not inconsistent with the oration; for Gregory there mentions a term of eight years; and yet Eusebius, who could not but be well informed, speaks of Gregory's being with Origen but five years. There was therefore in that space of eight years room for him to make an excursion from Cæsarea. And Berytus appears to me as likely a place as any, because it is mentioned by the authors before cited; and because, though at Origen's request Gregory laid aside his first intention of being a lawyer, yet he might think it not improper to visit the place, for the sake of which he left his native country, and stay a short season there. This might be thought likewise a piece of respect due to those who had recommended to him the study of the Roman laws. Nor was Berytus far from Cæsarea. Finally, it may be thought by some, that what Origen writes to Gregory, of his ability to become a lawyer of the first rank, implies, that his scholar at his return home had gained some farther knowledge of the law than he brought thence, which yet he could not receive from him at Cæsarea.

As Origen was settled at Cæsarea, when Gregory arrived there, he could not come thither before 231, if so soon. Since that is the earliest date possible of his arrival, and he mentions a term of eight years in his oration, I think he could not leave Origen before the year 239. And since from Origen's letter to Gregory, written some while after his return home, he was a mere layman, and there appears no prospect of his being immediately devoted

to the service of the church; and since Nyssen says, Gregory lived retired for some time, and when Phedimus sought for him he kept out of the way; it appears to me probable, that he could not be ordained before the year 243, if so soon: I am indeed inclined to a later date, and should chuse to place him at 245. And supposing him endowed with extraordinary gifts, (of which I make no doubt but he was at the time of his ordination, or soon after) he would convert many Gentiles, and make large additions to the small church he at first found in Neocæsarea, before the persecution in 250, when he retired; and afterwards, peace being restored, he returned to his people. He was certainly at the first council of Antioch in the cause of Paul in 264. Eusebius and Theodoret put that out of question. I do not at present recollect any learned moderns, who say he was at the second council in that city. Undoubtedly the generality of learned men have not been of opinion, that Gregory was present at that second council, because they have supposed he died very soon after the first. And Fabricius, who thinks he lived to the year 270, mentions only his presence at the first^t council, as having no ground to say he was at the second. However, Tillemont^u observes, that there is one Theodore among the bishops of the last council; and, as he adds, he may be our saint. But I think that to be very improbable; for, in the account which^w Eusebius gives of the first council, he calls our bishop Gregory, not Theodore; and placeth him and his brother Athenodorus next after Firmilian, who is the first. But in his Catalogue of the names of those who were present at the second council, Theodore, meant by Tillemont, is the fourteenth; and the next is Malchion, a presbyter; therefore he cannot be our bishop: that Theodore was either a presbyter, or the youngest of the bishops expressly named as present. In the account which Theodoret gives of the bishops at the first council, Gregory is first, his brother next, and after him Firmilian, as we saw (F) before. I think, therefore, that our Gregory did not attend at the second council of Antioch.

And perhaps some will here recollect what was said formerly (G) concerning the different results of those two councils. At the first, when Firmilian was present, and by his advice Paul was spared; at the second, when Firmilian was dead, he was deposed. If it be now farther considered, that those other two great lights, Gregory and his brother, were wanting in the second council,

^t Fabr. ib. p. 248. ^u Ibid. Art. x. fin. ^w Vid. Euseb. L. vii. cap. 28, 29, 30.
(F) See before, p. 43. (G) See vol. ii. chap. 39.

perhaps

perhaps we may still better account for the sentence then pronounced, which by some has been reckoned indiscreet, and not for the honour of the Christian name at that time.

The exact time of Gregory's death cannot be determined. I have mentioned two opinions; one supposing that he died in 265, soon after the first council at Antioch; the other supposing him to have lived till the reign of Aurelian, and not to have died before the year 270. I must leave it to every one to judge for himself, which of these two opinions is the more probable. I have before mentioned the reasons for each of them, and have nothing farther to add.

IV. Gregory's works, so far as we know any thing of them, are such as these.

1. A Panegyric Oration, in praise of Origen, pronounced in 239, still extant, and unquestionably his. Du Pin ^a says of it, 'that it is very eloquent, and that it may be reckoned one of the finest pieces of rhetoric in all antiquity.' It is the more admirable, because perhaps it is the first thing of the kind among Christians.

2. A Paraphrase of the Book of Ecclesiastes, mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue, and quoted by him ^y in his Commentary upon that book, and still extant.

3. Jerom afterwards adds in his Catalogue, that Gregory wrote several epistles; of which, however, we have now only one remaining, called a Canonical Epistle, to an anonymous bishop, written, ^z in 258 or ^a 262; consisting, as we now have it, of eleven canons, all allowed to be genuine, except ^b the last, which is doubted of, or plainly rejected, as no part of the original epistle, but since added to it.

These are all the works of Gregory taken notice of by Jerom.

4. To these may be added the Creed, or Faith, before referred to in Gregory Nyssen; and which, he says, our Gregory received from John the evangelist, before he began to act in his episcopal character. Of this Du Pin ^c speaks after this manner. 'St. Gregory of Nyssa, in his Life of this father, puts down a formula of faith, which he pretends [or affirms] our saint re-

^a As before. ^y Vir Sanctus Gregorius Ponti episcopus, O i-
genis auditor, in Metaphrasi Ecclesiastæ,
ita hunc locum intellexit. Hieron. Comm.
in Eccl. Cap. iv. v. 13, . . . 16. ^z Vid.
Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 253, and Tillemont,
as before, Art. xii. ^a Basnag. Ann.
240. n. vii. et 262, n. ii. ^b See Fabri-

cus and Tillemont as before. ^c Saint
Gézoire de Nyse rapporte dans la Vie de
ce Pere une formule de Foi qu'il pretend
que ce saint avoit reçu de Saint Jean dans
une vision qu'il avoit eue pendant la nuit,
et qu'on conservoit encore a ce qu'il dit
écrite de la main de Saint Gregoire Thau-
maturge. Bib. T. i. p. 184, 185.

ceived from St. John in a vision which he had in the night, and was preserved till that time, as he says, in the hand-writing of St. Gregory the wonder-worker.' It seems to me, therefore, that Du Pin was not satisfied of the genuineness of this creed. But that others who are able may with the less trouble judge of the force of his expressions, I have put the original French in the margin. It is, however, received as genuine by ^d Fabricius, ^e Bull, and many others. Basnage ^f says, it may be supposed to have been written in the year 240. He owns that Jerom's silence might occasion some doubt, in that he has not mentioned it with Gregory's other pieces. But since it is in Nyssen and Rufinus, he readily allows it, with other learned moderns, to be genuine. Frederic Spanheim, if I understand him, rejects ^g not only the Particular Exposition of Faith, to be mentioned hereafter, but likewise this creed. Mr. Lampe ^h seems to reject both the creed and the history of it; for he says, if those things related by Nyssen were true, and John had been sent from heaven on purpose to deliver this Formulary, it ought to be esteemed at least equally with his other writings.

For my part, I think this creed can by no means be relied upon as Gregory's. I shall mention the following reasons.

1. The account which Nyssen gives of the revelation of this creed is altogether improbable. Gregory, as he says, would not preach till he had a revelation of the faith made to him. But what need could Gregory have of such a thing? had he not been taught the Christian faith by Origen, under whose instruction he sat five whole years? if he still needed some farther light, was not Phedimus, bishop of Amasea? were not other bishops able to inform him? not to add, that Gregory had before him continually the sacred scriptures, in which all necessary truths are clearly revealed; and that he had been trained up by Origen in a high veneration for those divine writings. There is, therefore, no reason to think that Gregory would desire a particular revelation; and still less to suppose it would be granted, if desired; and that

^d Ut supra, p. 249. ^e Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 136, 137.

^f Mystica igitur expositio hæc anno 240, videtur exarata. Num ascribenda sit Gregorio, movere scrupulum potest silentium Hieronymi, qui Gregorianis operibus illam non inseruit. At cum a Nysseno, et a Rufino vindicetur, recentiores ut prætereamus, faciles largimur esse Gregorii. Basn. Ann. 240. n. vii.

^g Plurima tamen Gregorii hujus nomen falso præferunt, ver. gr. Expositio Fidei, adversus Arianos, seu Symbolum quod-

dam ex revelatione scilicet Johannis, et Mariæ Virginis, in quo expressa vox *ἐπιστολῆς*, et quod in apparitione tradiderint Gregorio, ut Nyssenus, et hodieque Mss. extat in Græcorum monasteriis, teste Sponio Itin. Spanh. Hist. Ecc. p. 778.

^h Hæc si vere ita gesta essent, formula talis ab ipso Johanne apostolo cœlitus missa communicata merito omnibus ejus scriptis mortali digito exaratis esset aut præferenda, aut saltem æquiparanda. Jo. Frid. Lampe in Evang. Johann. Prolegom.

in so profuse a manner, and without any occasion for it; by sending to him not only John, (though ⁱ he by some people has been thought better acquainted with the doctrine of the trinity than any other apostle or evangelist) but likewise our Lord's mother; as if John, or any other evangelist, could not have been sufficient. This overdoing ruins the credit of a relation with men of judgment and sedate thought. And Basnage, though he allows the creed to have been composed about the year 240, as before shewn, disputes ^k the account of this revelation by a variety of arguments, and seems to give no credit to it. It follows therefore, I think, that Nyssen is not to be relied upon in this matter.

2. The whole history of this matter is more suitable to the affairs of the fourth than of the third century, and that the middle or even former part of it. This creed contains nothing but the mysterious doctrine of the trinity. But why should Gregory desire information about that only? Was there nothing else to be taught by a Christian bishop? This shews that this story is a fiction of the fourth century, when the controversy about the trinity filled all men's heads. In the early times of Christianity the creeds, though short, usually contained in them, beside the doctrine of the one God, divers historical matters relating to our Lord's life, death, resurrection, exaltation, and other important articles, concerning future retributions; as, our Lord's second coming to judgment, the resurrection of the body, and the like: of all which things there is not one article, one tittle, in this creed.

3. This creed is not taken notice of in Jerom's Catalogue. Indeed, in some copies of that work there is added after Gregory's Epistles, and Of the Faith, [et de Fide.] But it is allowed ^l by the best critics that those words are not genuine; whereas, if Jerom had known of that creed, and believed it to be genuine, he could not have omitted it. Would any author, writing the life of Moses, though in the most brief and summary way conceivable, take no notice of the ten commandments delivered to him in so honourable a manner? Nor could any writer of Gregory's life omit to mention a creed received from John the evangelist, and preserved in his own hand-writing in the records of his church,

l. i. cap. vi. p. 102. ⁱ Ἀλλ' ὁμῶς οὗ τοῦ-
τος, ὁ ἀγραμματος, . . . ἰδε ποῦ τετυγχῆ
πνεύματος, ὥστε αὐτὸς μὴδεὶς τῶν ἄλλων εὐαγγε-
λιστῶν ἡμᾶς ἐδίδαξεν, αὐτὸς ταῦτα βροτῆσαι.
Theophyl. Proleg. in Joh. Evang. Conf.
Lampe Prolegom. in Joh. Ev. Lib. 2,
cap. ii. init. et cap. iii. p. 178. ^k Re-

velationis ejusmodi nobis est difficillima
fides. Tanto nil opus miraculo fuit ad
indicandum beatissimæ trinitatis myste-
rium, quod oraculis scripturæ diserte pan-
ditur. Neque Deo moris est, sanctos e cœ-
lo mittere, qui scripturarum contenta
consignent in animo, &c. ibid. n. v.

and published, and often copied thence, undoubtedly, if there was any such thing. Whether this argument be decisive or not, it is of some force. They who made the interpolation before-mentioned did not like this omission.

4. If Basil may be relied on, in a dialogue now lost, Gregory expressed himself inaccurately about the doctrine of the trinity. This may be thought to weaken, if not to overthrow, Nyssen's relation: for if, as he says, Gregory was ^m particularly solicitous to have information in that doctrine, before he begun to preach, and did actually receive a ⁿ distinct revelation of it, he must have discoursed accurately upon that head at all seasons, when arguing with heathens, and upon every other occasion; nor could he ever be at a loss for the greatest propriety of expression. One would think, likewise, that Basil should not have dared to censure any expressions of Gregory relating to the trinity, if it had been a thing well known in those times, that he had been instructed in that doctrine by express and particular revelation.

5. St. Basil, in all his disputes with the people of Neocæsarea, says nothing of any written creed of our Gregory. He reminds them, over and over, of his grandmother Macrina, that blessed and famous woman, sprung from among them, who had the doctrine of Gregory safely preserved in her memory, which she likewise as carefully delivered to him in his childhood; but not one word of a written creed deposited with the Neocæsareans. This argument appears to me unanswerable: and every one is able to judge of it from St. Basil's epistles, which have been so largely transcribed. It appears to me to a great degree probable, that either there was no written creed at Neocæsarea reputed Gregory's, or that it was not to Basil's purpose; otherwise he must have referred to it. What good reason can be assigned why, in so warm a dispute, Basil should so often appeal to the instructions he received from his grandmother when he was a child, but say nothing of a written creed in Gregory's hand-writing, which he had, or might have seen and read, when a man, if there had been any such thing? Basil, who made so good use of that circumstance, that he had been educated by a relation, his grandmother, sprung from among them, to shew the Neocæsareans that his faith was the same with that of their great Gregory, would have triumphed much more if there had been an authentic written creed, and his sentiments had been agreeable to it. Nyssen, in an oration de-

^l Vid. Fabr. ib. p. 251.

^m Vid. Greg. Nyss. de Vit. Greg. Thaum. p. 545. A. B.

ⁿ Vid. ibid. p. 546. E.

livered we know not where nor to whom, talks of a creed at Neocæsarea in Gregory's hand-writing: but Basil, in his epistles to the Neocæsareans themselves, mentions no such thing, though extremely to his purpose, much more than any thing said by him. I think it not difficult to know who ought most to be regarded, Basil, or his brother Gregory of Nyssa.

The creed then in Nyssen is not the creed of our great Gregory, but a fiction of the fourth century, after the rise and heats of the controversy about the Trinity; when the whole church was divided upon that head, and some people were willing to have Gregory on their side, to support their doctrine, or their manner of expression.

6. There are some other pieces which have been published as his; as, A particular Exposition of the Faith, three or four Homilies, and some other things. But ° learned men being now generally agreed that they are supposititious, I need not take any farther notice of them.

7. However, there are some Fragments in a Greek chain, which Fabricius^p seems to allow to be Gregory's: they are four in number; I intend to make use of three of them hereafter in the article of Testimonies to the books of the New Testament.

V. Having seen such a history, and such testimonies to Gregory, as time has spared us, and having likewise observed what are his genuine works, we are better able to form to ourselves some idea of him; and may now take at least his more remarkable features, which are extremely beautiful.

His farewell Oration at Cæsarea is the monument of a bright genius improved by education; here likewise appears a mind of a fair and candid complexion, with a grateful temper toward the conductor of his studies. The nobility of his family is unquestioned. Origen himself, who was well acquainted with our Gregory, and was no flatterer, bears witness to his excellent capacity, which he consecrated to God and true religion, abandoning all earthly pursuits and expectations. He was a bishop of singular note and eminence, as appears from Eusebius and the concurring testimony of many other ecclesiastical writers. His history, as delivered by authors of the fourth and following centuries, particularly by Nyssen, it is to be feared, has in it somewhat of fiction; but there can be no reasonable doubt made but he was very

° Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. Du Pin. Biblioth. Fabr. ib. p. 253, 254. Tillem. ib. Art. xii.

^p Fragmenta quedam Gregorii Thaumaturgi occurrere in Catena ad Jeremiam Ghisleriana, Tom i. . . jam notavit præ-

stantissimus Caveus. Illa non ex Commentario in Prophetam, sed ex Homilia quadam vel epistola videntur esse repetita. Fabr. ib. p. 254.

successful in making converts to Christianity in the country of Pontus, about the middle of the third century; and that, beside his natural and acquired abilities, he was favoured with extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and wrought miracles of surprising power. The plain and express testimonies of Basil and others, at no great distance of time or place from Gregory, must be reckoned sufficient grounds of credit with regard to these things. Theodoret mentioning Gregory, and his brother, and Firmilian, and Helenus, all together, ascribes miracles to none but him alone. They were all bishops of the first rank: nevertheless Gregory had a distinction even among them. It is the same thing in Jerom's Letter to Magnus: there are mentioned Hippolytus; Julius Africanus, Dionysius of Alexandria, and many others, of great note and eminence for learning and piety. But Theodore, afterwards called Gregory, is the only one who is called a man of apostolical signs and wonders. Jerom's words (H) likewise in his Catalogue, though somewhat obscure, are very remarkable. I have rendered them thus; 'he is chiefly famous for the miracles ' he wrought when bishop, to the great honour of the churches.' They imply, if I mistake not, that Gregory was in his time the admiration of all mankind, not only in Pontus and the neighbouring countries, but also in other parts. The extraordinary gifts of the Spirit had not then entirely ceased: but Gregory was favoured with such gifts greatly beyond the common measure of other Christians or bishops at that season. This was much taken notice of, and it was greatly to the honour of the Christian profession all over the world. So Jerom. I see no reason, therefore, why we may not adopt the words of Eucherius, bishop of Lyons in the fifth century, as containing in short a just and true character of this person; 'that ¹ he was at first great and eminent ' in the world for philosophy and eloquence, but afterwards ' greater and more eminent for his virtues,' or miracles.

His church continued steadfast in the faith after his death; and near the end of the fourth century the Neocæsareans were all Christians, having been all along to that very day blessed with pastors who were men of true worth. As Gregory therefore was an honour and ornament to the churches in his time, so his church continued to be an honour to him. The people of Neocæsarea retained for a long while remarkable impressions of religion; and they had an affection for the primitive simplicity, very rare and

(H) See before, p. 26.

¹ Gregorius e Ponto sacerdos, philosophia primus apud mundum et eloquentia

præstans; sed postea major præstantiorque virtutibus. Eucher. ad Valerian. ap. Bibl. Patr. Max. T. vi. p. 859. H.

uncommon, almost singular at that time, when innovations came into the church apace. In particular, they could by no means approve of the common zeal for the monastic life. Those good people must have been apprehensive of the bad consequences of that institution, if they did not actually see some inconveniences attending it: for ^r Basil complains that they made reflections upon the conduct of the women in those societies; which it is not easy to think they would do without ground. It seems that they made the best stand they were able against that and other innovations. But popular things will have their course, notwithstanding the most judicious reasons and the most pathetic remonstrances to the contrary. Every age of the world seeth examples of this kind both in the church and in civil life.

And now I cannot but think there is reason to lament two things:

1. That no more of this great and excellent man's works are come down to us. It is plain some of his writings are lost; for Jerom speaks of his epistles, whereas we have no more than one remaining. And Basil mentions an Exposition of Faith, or a Dialogue with a Gentile, which is not in being.

2. That we have no history of his life, written by some contemporary in the plain and simple way he lived. This I take to be the greatest loss of the two: for though he might leave behind some letters and some other pieces, which were both edifying and instructive, yet it is likely, as Jerom intimates, that he was more eminent for his signs and wonders than his writings. It may be well supposed that this apostolical man was chiefly employed in increasing his church, or in building it up in knowledge and virtue, by oral instructions and works of goodness, charitable or miraculous. Possibly such a history as we now wish for was composed, but was seldom transcribed, and therefore soon lost, as not suiting the taste which not long after prevailed in the church. This may be thought very probable, that if such a relation had been then drawn up, and still preserved, it would be more valuable than any thing written afterwards. A father of the fourth century, destitute of the gifts of the Spirit, whose chief talent is oratory, whose mind is heated with the controversies, and tainted with the credulity and partiality of his age, is not fit to write the life of a man of primitive simplicity, endowed with a large measure of apostolical gifts and virtues.

^r Εἰ δὲ τίνα ἀκοσμίαν τῶ βασιλῶν τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπιφάνειαν, ἀπολογισθαι μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἢ καταδεχόμεναι. Ἐκείνῳ δὲ ὑμῶν διαμαρτυροῦμαι, ὅτι αὐτοὶ μέχρι νῦν ὁ σατανᾶς ὁ πατήρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰπὼν ἡ κατὰ δόξαν, ταῦτα αἱ ἀφοβοὶ καρδίαι, καὶ τὰ ἀγαλλίστα ἡρώματα αὐτῶν φεγγεῖται ἀδίκως. Βασίλ. Ερ. 207, α. 63. p. 310. E.

VI. Nothing farther remains, but that we observe Gregory's testimony to the scriptures of the New Testament.

1. And here, since nothing appears to the contrary, it ought to be taken for granted, that he had the same or very near the same canon of scripture with his master Origen. However, I shall take notice of some particulars, though much cannot be reasonably expected in the few and short pieces of his which we now have.

2. When Gregory came to Origen he was ignorant of the scriptures, as he plainly ^s intimates; but when he left him he was well acquainted with the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as appears from his quotations and allusions to them in his Panegyric Oration.

3. In his Canonical Epistle are these words: 'the ^t apostle ^s says; *Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy both it and them:* 1 Cor. vi. 13. And our Saviour also, *purifying all meats says; Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth;* Matt. xv. 11.

4. The Fragments, formerly mentioned as preserved in a sort of Greek chain, are fine sentences. It is not certain from what work they are taken; but, if they are genuine, it appears not improbable that they are taken from some homily or epistle of our Gregory.

In one of those fragments he says: 'The ^u scribes and pharisees of the Jewish people would never have received such repeated woes from our Saviour, if it had not been for their hypocrisy: for our Lord's reproofs of their faults continually begin and are prefaced in this (κ) manner; *Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites.* And he calleth them *whited sepulchres, which indeed appear to men beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness:* Matt. xxiii. 27.

5. In another of these fragments he says; 'For ^w if we do any good to our neighbour out of sincere and undissembled love, we shall hear from our Saviour: *Inasmuch as ye have done it unto*

^s Τὸ αὐτὸν μὲν ὑπερον ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς βιβλίοις. Orat. ad Orig. p. 60. A.

^t ὁ δὲ ἀποστόλος φησὶ, Τα βρώματα. . . . Ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος πάντα καθαρίζον τα βρώματα. κ. λ. Ep. Can. cap. i. p. 38. A.

^u ἢ καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι τὴν λαὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων πολλὴν τὴν καὶ παρὰ τὴν σωτῆρος ἐκλερονομήσαν, ἢ μὴ διὰ τὴν ὑποκρίσιν. ἢ γὰρ τοῖς ἐλαχίστοις ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν ἢ καὶ παύσατο κατὰ πάσαν αἰτίαν προλεγων ὁ κύριος· καὶ ὑμεῖς γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι ὑποκρίται, κεκοσμημένους ταφῆς ἀποκαλῶν αὐτοὺς· οἱ

ἐξωθεν μὲν φαίνονται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὡραῖοι, ἐσωθεν δὲ γέμισιν ὀφείν νεκρῶν, καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας. ap. Mich. Ghislerium in Jerem. cap. ix. v. 4. T. i. p. 788, 789. Lugdun. 1623. (κ) See Matt. xxiii. 13, 14, 15, 23, 25, 27.

^w Εὰν γὰρ τι εἰς τὸ πολλὸν ἀγαθὸν ἐργασώμεθα διὰ τῆς ἀνποκρίτης ἀγάπης, ἀκνομεν παρὰ τὴν σωτῆρος· Εἴ ποτε ἐποιήσατε ἐν τῶν τῶν ἀδελφῶν μὴ τῶν ἐλαχίστων, ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε. κ. λ. ap. eund. in Jerem. cap. ix. v. 8, 9. p. 796.

‘one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me;’ Matt. xxv. 40. What follows in this fragment is a fine reproof of false pretences of kindness, and the practice of artifice and deceit toward honest and undesigning persons. But I must not allow myself to transcribe it here at length.

6. In his Panegyric Oration he refers to and enlarges upon the history of the poor widow, which we have in Mark xii. 41. . . . 44. Luke xxi. 1. . . . 4. which he says is in the ^x sacred books: referring however, perhaps, more particularly to St. Luke’s than St. Mark’s gospel; and calling again our Lord’s estimation of that poor widow’s gift ^y a determination of the divine word.

7. In the same Oration he has a beautiful allusion ^z to the parable of the prodigal, which is in Luke xv. He there also alludes to ^a Luke x. 30.

8. It is very probable from that Oration, that he was acquainted with ^b St. John’s gospel, particularly the beginning of it.

9. In the Canonical Epistle he says, ‘it is not easy ^c to represent in one letter all that the divine scriptures have said, not only against so horrible a sin as robbery, but even against covetousness, or the love of filthy lucre.’ However, he largely quotes one place of scripture, thus; ‘but ^d fornication,’ says he, ‘and covetousness, let it not be named among you: for which things ^e sake the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them: for ye were sometime darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord. Walk as children of the light, (for (L) the fruit of the light is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth;) proving what is acceptable to the Lord. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. For it is a shame even to speak of those things, which are done of them in secret. But all things that are reprov’d are made manifest by the light. These things says the apostle,’ Eph. v. 3. . . . 13.

10. Origen, in his Epistle to Gregory, refers to several texts of scripture, and among others to ^e Hebr. iii. 14.

11. In the third of the fragments beforementioned it is said; ‘Pride ^f cannot but be evil, it being founded in much false con-

^x Οὕτως ἐν ἡμετέροις βιβλίοις φέρεται, ὅτι δὴ μικρὰ τίς καὶ πτωχὴ γυνὴ. κ. λ. Orat. ad Orig. p. 60. A. ^y ὁ μὲν λόγος ἐπαθμησατο. ib. D. ^z Vid. p. 75. A. B.

^a Ib. p. 76. B. ^b Ib. p. 53. D. 54. A.

^c Δεῖν δὲ πλεονεξία, καὶ ἢ ἐν δὲ ἐπιστολῇ μίας παραθεῖναι τὰ βραβύλα, ἐν οἷς. κ. λ. Ep. Can. ii. p. 38. C. ^d Περνεῖα γὰρ, φησὶ, καὶ πλεονεξία μὴ ονομαζέσθω ἐν ἡμῖν. . . . (ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τῆς φωτὸς ἐν πᾶσι

ἀγαθοῖς, καὶ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ ἀληθεία). . .

Τοιαῦτα γὰρ ἀποστόλος. ibid. p. 38. D. 39. A. B. (L.) fruit of the light.] This

reading deserves to be taken notice of. It is no uncommon reading, but is found in Mss. versions, and writers. Perhaps it is the true reading. See Mill. Grot. Beaufobre and Lefant, upon the place.

^e Orig. Ep. ad Greg. T. i. p. 32. C. Bened.

^f ἢ ἀγαθὸν ἢ ὑπερηφάνια, ψευδοδοξία, ἢ ἄλλο

^c ceit.

‘ceit. For it is most manifest, that every perfect good cometh from God: nor is it otherwise to be obtained by man.’ Here seems to be a reference to James i. 17. and if this fragment is genuine, it may be reckoned a proof that Gregory was acquainted with the epistle of St. James, and had a respect for it.

I have now quoted three of the fragments which I spoke of formerly. I have no occasion at present to make any use of the fourth.

12. In Gregory’s Panegyric Oration is supposed to be a reference ^g either to Rev iii. 7. or to If. xxii. 22.

13. He speaks of Origen’s advices ^h to attend to God and his prophets. He there likewise makes mention of the assistances Origen gave him for understanding the difficult places of the sacred scriptures. His veneration for which scriptures has appeared in several passages above cited.

14. If the last, or eleventh canon of the epistle had been genuine, I should here have observed somewhat in it: but since it is an addition of later times, it ought not to be taken notice of in this place.

It is needless to add any thing more, considering the relation Gregory had to Origen and his respect for him. They must both have had the same canon of scripture, or very much alike, as was observed before; and undoubtedly they agreed in a peculiar regard for those writings, which they received as sacred and divine.

C H A P. XLIII.

DIONYSIUS, bishop of Alexandria.

- I. *His history in general.* II. *Some revelations vouchsafed to him.* III. *More select passages.* IV. *His concern in the controversies of that time, as Novatianism.* V. *The millennium.* VI. *The baptism of heretics.* VII. *Sabellianism.* VIII. *The affair of Paul of Samosata.* IX. *Dionysius’s works.* X. *His character.* XI. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament, as the four gospels.* XII.

πολλῶν· ἄλλων γὰρ ἄλλως ὡς πᾶσι ἀγαθὸν τε-
λεῖον θεοῦ ἐρχεται· καὶ ἡ ἐστὶ λεπτόν αλ-
λως ἀνθρώπων. κ. λ. ap. Ghisler. in Jerem.
cap. ix. v. 23, 24. p. 831.

§ p. 73. B.

^h μόνῳ δὲ προσίχιν Θεῷ, καὶ τοῖς τῷτε προ-
φῆταις, αὐτὸς υποφῆτιων καὶ σαφηνίζων,
ὅτι ποτε σκοτεινὸν καὶ αἰνιγματώδες ἦ, οἷα
πολλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐστὶ φανταῖς. ib. p. 72. D.

The Acts, Paul's epistles, and to the Hebrews. XIII. *The Catholic epistles.* XIV. *The Revelation, and other books of the New Testament.* XV. *What Dionysius writes of the Revelation largely examined.* XVI. *A brief review of that whole argument, with remarks.* XVII. *The sum of his testimony.*

I. UPON the promotion of Heraclas to the bishopric of Alexandria, in the year of Christ 231 or 232, Dionysius^a succeeded him in the chair of the catechetical school of that city: and Heraclas having died in the year 246 or 247, Dionysius was chosen bishop in his room, in the year^b 247 or^c 248, and died in the twelfth of the emperor Gallienus, in the year of Christ 264, or at the utmost in^d 265. He is^e reckoned the thirteenth bishop of Alexandria. He was succeeded by Maximus.

We may observe some passages of ancient authors concerning the time of his death. Eusebius, speaking of the first council of Antioch in the affair of Paul, bishop of that city, computed to have been held in^f 264, says, 'At^g this time died Dionysius, 'in the twelfth year of the reign of Gallienus, having been bishop 'of Alexandria seventeen years. His successor was Maximus.' Theodoret^{ss} says, 'that Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, a man 'of uncommon learning, in a letter excused his coming thither, 'because of the infirmities of age.' The bishops of the second council of Antioch, assembled in^h 269, speak of Firmilian and Dionysius as dead, callingⁱ them men of blessed memory. Moreover, Eusebius assures us, that their synodical epistle was^k sent to Dionysius bishop of Rome, and Maximus bishop of Alexandria, and to all the provinces of the empire. This latter council therefore was not in the time of Dionysius himself, but of his successor.

It is generally taken for granted that he was an Alexandrian: and from some things said by himself it has been concluded that

^a Dionysius Alexandrinæ urbis episcopus sub Heracla scholam κατηχησέων presbyter tenuit, et Origenis valde insignis auditor fuit. . . . Moritur duodecimo Gallieni anno. Hieron. de V. I. cap. 69. Conf. Euseb. H. E. l. vi. c. 29 et 35. vii. cap. 28. ^b . . . tandemque anno 247, mortuo Heraclæ in sede Alexandrina successit. Cav. Hist. Lit. P. i. c. 95. Heraclæ, qui superiore anno mortem invenerat, successit Dionysius qui annis xvii. Alexandrinæ præfuit ecclesiæ, initio a currente deducto. Bafn. An. 247. n. v. ^c See Tillemont Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. p. 539, 540. St.

Denys d' Alexand. Art. ii. and Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 263. ^d Vid. Pagi Crit. 265. n. iv. et Fabric. ib. ^e Alexandrinam ecclesiam tertius decimus episcopus tenuit Dionysius ann. xvii. Euseb. Chron. p. 174. ^f Vid. Bafn. Ann. 264, n. iii. &c. ^g Euf. l. vii. cap. 28. ^{ss} . . . ανβαλ- λητο μεν την εκδημιαν, δια την τη γηρας απο- θεωσαν. Har. Fab. l. 2. c. 8. Conf. Euf. H. E. l. 7. cap. 27. p. 277. D. ^h Vid. Pagi Crit. 269. xii. 271, ii. iii. Bafn. Ann. 269. n. iv. ⁱ . . . της μακαριτας, αρ. Euseb. ib. c. 30. p. 279. D. ^k ibid. B.

he^l was of an honourable and wealthy family, and that^m for some time he was involved in the darkness and errors of Gentilism. He had Origenⁿ for his master, and was one of the most noted of his scholars. His episcopate was full of troubles; there having happened in the time of it the two persecutions of Decius and Valerian, beside a pestilence that ravaged the whole Roman empire, and other calamities in common, and some civil commotions with which Alexandria in particular was affected. It was likewise a busy and active period, on account of the controversies about Novatianism, the millennium, the baptism of heretics, and the doctrine of the trinity, in all which Dionysius had some concern, and signalized himself by his learning, zeal, moderation, and prudence. This is a summary account of the life of this bishop of Alexandria: but his eminent merit, and the time in which he flourished, require of us a more particular history.

The Decian persecution^o began in the year 249, or the beginning of 250; but there was a persecution raised against the Christians of Alexandria in the year^p 248, whilst other churches enjoyed great peace under the emperor Philip. This persecution^q lasted a whole year, and was concluded by nothing but a sedition and disturbance among the Gentiles themselves. In a fragment of a letter of Dionysius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, is an account of several who^r suffered martyrdom in that popular persecution, and of the breaking open and plundering the houses of Christians in that city. ‘Nor^s had we,’ says Dionysius, ‘a safe passage any where, through high streets or narrow lanes, neither by night nor by day; but continually, and every where, the people were universally crying out, “If any one refuse to pronounce such or such impious words, let him be immediately taken up and thrown into the fire.” So things went for a long time, till a sedition among themselves, and a civil war, returned this cruelty upon them. We^u had then a little breathing time: but presently news came of the end of that reign which had been favourable to us, and all were seized

^l . . . πολλά γὰρ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν καὶ αὐτὴ γένεσις, ὅσας ἀριθμῆσαι δυνατόν ἐστι περὶ τῶν ἀποφασικῶν, δημοτικῶν, προγραφῶν, ὑπαρχόντων ἀρπαγῶν, ἀξιωμάτων ἀποθέσεων, δοξῶν κοσμικῆς οὐλοῦρας, ἐπαινῶν ἡγεμονικῶν καὶ βουλευτικῶν καταφρονησέων. κ. λ. Dionys. ap. Euf. L. vii. ca. xi. p. 260. A. B.

^m καὶ σοὶ γεγενῆσθαι τὸ ἐξάρχης, καὶ τῆς πιστοῦς αὐτοῦ. ap. Euf. l. vii. cap. 7. p. 253. C.

ⁿ See before note a.

^o Vid. Pagi, 250. num. iv Basnag. Ann.

250. num. ii. iii.

248. n. viii.

^q ἢ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς προσηλαστικῆς οὐλοῦρας παρ’ ἡμῶν ἤρξατο, ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐλοῦν ἐμαυτὸν προσηλαστικῶς. Dionys. in Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euf. l. vi. c. 41. in.

^r ibid. p. 236. 237.

^s καὶ σμικρὸν μὲν προσανέπνευσαν. . . . εὐθὺς δὲ ἡ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκείνης τῆς ἐμμενέμενης μεταβολῇ διαγγέλλεται. . . . καὶ δὴ καὶ παρὴν τὸ προσηλαστικόν. ib. p. 238. A.

^p Vid. Pagi Crit.

‘with fears of an impending storm. Then came the edict;’ that is, Decius’s edict of persecution, published at Alexandria in the beginning of the year 250.

Soon ^w after the arrival of that edict, as Dionysius writes to Germanus, Sabinus, prefect of Egypt, gave orders for apprehending him. The officer, supposing he must needs have fled and absconded in such a time of manifest danger, made a diligent search every where, excepting only the bishop’s own house, where Dionysius continued four days after the prefect’s order for taking him up; but on the fifth day, having received a special direction from God, who likewise opened a way for his escape, he removed, accompanied ^x by his servants and many of the brethren. He was nevertheless very soon after, that very night as it seems, apprehended by a band of soldiers, and carried to Taposyris, a small village in that part of Egypt which was called Mareotis. Then he was taken out of their custody by some country people in a very odd and unexpected manner, and against his own consent. Being thus rescued out of the hands of that strong guard by which he had been first taken, he retired and lived privately in a desert part of Libya, distant three days journey from Parætonium. The Decian persecution being over, Dionysius returned to his charge at Alexandria some time in the year 251.

Gallus succeeded Decius before the end of the year 251; and Dionysius speaks of a persecution in his reign: for he says expressly that ^y ‘Gallus banished those holy men that offered up prayers to God for his peace and safety.’ Whether any suffered at this time in Egypt is not certain; nor is there much notice taken of this matter in ancient ecclesiastical writers. Pagi ^z therefore concludes, that this was only a local persecution, and that it was felt in few places except Rome, where Cornelius, and afterwards Lucius, were banished by this emperor.

In the year 253, Valerian and his son Gallienus succeeded Gallus and Volusian. The persecution began in the year 257, and ended in other parts of the empire in 259, when Valerian was taken captive by the Persians; but at Alexandria it continued till the year 261, when Gallienus overcame Macrian, in whose power Egypt had been till that time. Then Gallienus sent the same favourable edicts to Alexandria which had been sent before to several other parts of the empire. Our Dionysius speaks of this persecution having lasted ^a forty-two months, or three years and a half; which ought to be understood of Egypt only, not of the

^w Vid. Euf. l. vi. cap. 40. ^x εγω τε vii. cap. i. ^z Pagi 252. n. x. xii. xvi.
και οι παιδες και πολλοι των αδελφων αμα . . . xxi. ^a ap. Euseb. l. vii. cap. x. in.
συμπελθον. ib. p. 235. C. ^y Euf. l.

rest of the empire. The difficulties relating to this point have been finely cleared up by Pagi, to ^b whom I refer, and ^c to Bafnage, who does not much differ from him.

Soon after the arrival of the edict at Alexandria, before the end of the ^d year 257, as seems most probable, Dionysius was summoned before Emilian, then prefect of Egypt. He went to him, as ^e Dionysius himself writes, ‘attended by his fellow-presbyter Maximus, and by Faustus, Eusebius and Cheremon, deacons, and a Christian brother from Rome, then at Alexandria. Emilian requiring him to renounce the Christian religion, Dionysius answered without delay, that *we ought to obey God rather than men*, (Acts v. 29.) and assured the prefect that he was a worshipper of the one God, and could worship no other, nor could he ever cease to be a Christian. Whereupon he ordered them to a place called Cephro, in Libya, forbidding them to hold any assemblies. Nor could Dionysius obtain a delay of one day, though he was sick.’

In his banishment he retained a tender affection and concern for his people, and watched over them, carefully convening them, as he ^f says, *absent indeed in body, but present in spirit*; 1 Cor. v. 3. At Cephro he had a large number of the faithful, partly such as came to him thither from Alexandria, partly such as came from other places of Egypt. ‘And here,’ says ^h he, ‘*God opened a door to us for preaching the word*; 1 Cor. xvi. 9. 2 Cor. ii. 12. At first the people of the place were rude, and ready to pelt us with stones, but afterwards not a few of the Gentiles, *forsaking idols turned unto God*; 1 Thess. i. 9. Then first the seed of the word was sown among them by us; for hitherto it had not been preached unto them: and, as if for that purpose God had brought us to them, when we had fulfilled that ministry, he removed us; Acts xii. 25. For Emilian, as if desirous to send us into some more uncomfortable place than Libya itself, gave orders for dispersing some others in several villages of Mareotis; and us he commanded to reside in the district of Colluthio, near the great road, that we might be the nearer at hand to be brought to Alexandria, if he should think fit.’

How long this banishment lasted, is not absolutely certain. Tillemont ⁱ says, it is evident that Dionysius continued in this exile about two years at least, because in that time he wrote two

^b Pagi 261. n. viii. et seq.

^c Bafn. l. vii cap. xi. p. 251.

^e ib. p. 259. A.

257. n. iii.

^f Vid. Pagi Crit. in Bar.

^h ib. p. 259. A. B. C.

ⁱ Mem. i. iv.

257. n. iv. Bafn. 247. n. vi.

^f ap. Euseb. P. ii. p. 588. S. Denys d' Alex. Art. xiii.

festal epistles, concerning the observation of Easter, as ^k Eusebius relates. One of those epistles was directed to Flavius, the other to Domitius and Didymus. I would just observe, that in the same place Eusebius adds; ‘beside these, Dionysius wrote ‘another letter to his fellow-presbyters of Alexandria, and other ‘letters to divers other persons, the persecution still raging.’ Pagi ^l has taken notice of several of the letters written at that time. Bafnage ^m computes Dionysius’s exile to have lasted four years, supposing him to have been banished in 257; as does ⁿ Pagi: but I do not see any proof of so long a continuance of that exile; though it might be full three years, or somewhat more.

In the year ^o 261, if ^p not before, Dionysius returned to his people at Alexandria, and officiated again among them, to their great satisfaction and profit. But, as ^q Eusebius observes, the peace was of short duration at Alexandria; for that city was again afflicted with sedition and war, and then ^r with pestilence. The disturbance here intended, Valefius ^s and ^t Pagi and ^u Bafnage suppose to be the rebellion of Emilian, which broke out in the latter part of the year 261. The Festal, or Paschal epistle of Dionysius to Hierax an Egyptian bishop, of which ^w Eusebius has preserved some fragments, describing the unhappy circumstances of Alexandria in the time of that sedition, is supposed by ^x Pagi and ^y Bafnage to have been written in the year 262. There follow in ^z Eusebius fragments of a letter to Dionysius, giving an account of the pestilence in that city, which letter appears plainly to have been written in ^a the year of Christ 263. Tillemont ^b thinks this may be the same that Jerom calls ‘the Letter concerning the mortality. After this Eusebius ^c mentions one more Festal epistle of Dionysius, and consequently written in the year 264. Eusebius ^d particularly observes, that the city of Alexandria then enjoyed peace. And thus we have brought down our general history of this great man to the end of his life, or near it; for it is not improbable that ^e he died in this very year 264.

^k l. vii. cap. 20.

^l Crit. 257. n. iv.

cap. 22.

^s Valef. Ann. in Euf. p. 151.

^m Pace apud Ægyptum constituta, post extinctum Macrianum, ejusque liberos Macrianum et Quietum, Dionysius quadriennii exilium passus edicto Gallieni Alexandriam anno 261, revocatur. Bafn. A. 247. n. vi.

ⁿ Vid. Pagi 257. n. iv.

^o Vid. Bafn. ib. et Pagi 262. n. ii.

^p επιλαβης δε οσω επω της ειρνης, επανισι μεν εις την αλεξανδρειαν. Euseb. l. 7. cap. 21. in.

^q Vid. Euseb. ib. ^r Ibid.

^t Pagi 262. n. ii.

^u Bafn. 247. vi.

^w l. vii. cap. 21.

^x Pagi 262. n. ii.

^y An. 247. n. vii. sub fin.

^z ib. c. 22.

^a Vid. Bafnag. An. 247. n. vii. sub fin.

^b Tillem. St. Denys d’A. Art. xiv. p. 593.

^c as before. ^d et alia de Mortalitate.

^e De V. I. cap. 69. ^f ibid. p. 269. D.

^g εισηνευσαντων των κατὰ την πολιν. ibid.

^h See Tillemont, p. 594. Bafn. 247. n. vi.

and before, page 58. note ^d.

II. Dionysius was favoured with some revelations from heaven: We (A) formerly saw an account of a special direction he received from God to leave Alexandria, at the beginning of the persecution under Decius. He had another like direction, to encourage him to try all things, and to read all sorts of books. For Eusebius informs us, that Dionysius, in his third letter concerning baptism, sent to Philemon, presbyter at Rome, writes after this manner; 'As^h for me,' says he, 'I have read the works and the traditions of the heretics; defiling my mind undoubtedly, for a while, with their execrable opinions. But then I have had this advantage in the end, that I have been more fully convinced of their falsehood, and my detestation of them has been increased. One of the brethren, a presbyter, would have dissuaded me from this course, fearing the consequence, and telling me that my mind would be defiled: and indeed I am sensible he spoke truly: nevertheless, I thought I ought to proceed as I had begun: and I was confirmed therein by a vision from heaven; for a voice came to me, expressly commanding me to this purpose; "Read whatever comes to your hands, for you are able to examine and try all things; and this was the first occasion of your embracing the faith." I therefore gladly received the vision, as agreeing with (B) the apostolical precept, directed especially to such as are strong: *Be ye skilful money-changers,* or, in (C) other words, *prove all things*; and what follows. 1 Thes. v. 21.

Nothing certainly more worthy to be the matter of a revelation than this command; nor could any thing be more honourable to Dionysius than this vision. Here is an admirable argument for freedom of inquiry; it had been the first occasion of Dionysius's becoming a Christian; it must therefore be advantageous afterwards. By this means Christianity was spread at the beginning; and by this means it cannot be obstructed: the reason is, because it is true; and examination and inquiry are

(A) See p. 60. *Ἐ Καὶ μόλις μετὰ τῆς τετάρτης ἡμέρας κελυσσάντος με μεταστῆναι τῇ Θεῷ, καὶ παραδόξως οδοποιήσαντος. . . . Καὶ οὗτις τῆς τῇ Θεῷ προνοίας ἔργον ἰκεῖνο γίγνηται, τὰ ἐξ ἑδὴλωσεν. Euf. l. 6. c. 40. p. 235. C. Ἡ Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τοῖς συνταγμασὶ καὶ ταῖς παραδόξαις τῶν αἰρετικῶν ἐνέτιχον. κ. λ. l. 7. c. vii. p. 253. A. Ὁραμα θεοπεμπτον. προσελθόν, ἐπερρωσε με. Καὶ λόγος πρὸς με γινόμενος, πρῶσταξε διαρρηδὴν λέγων· πᾶσιν ἐντυχάνει οἱς αὐτὸς χειρὰς λαβοῖς· διευθυνὴν γὰρ ἰκαταῖα καὶ δοκιμαζέτω ἵκανος εἶ. καὶ σοὶ γίγνηται τὸτο ἐξ-αίρετος καὶ τῆς πίστεως αἰτίου. Ἀποδιζαμένη*

το ὄραμα, ὡς ἀποστολικὴ φωνὴ συντρέχον τῇ λέγειν πρὸς τῆς δυνατώτερης. Γνωστὸν δοκιμοῖ τραπέζιται. ib. p. 253. B. C.

(B) Mr. Whiston supposeth that Dionysius refers to the Apostolical Constitutions. Lib. ii. cap. 36. See his Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions, chap. iv. § 24, in his Primitive Christianity, &c. Vol. iii. p. 425. But Mr. Whiston's arguments have been fully confuted by Mr. Robert Turner, in his Discourse of the pretended Apostolical Constitutions. Ch. xiv. p. 134 . . . 136. (C) See before, Vol. ii. Ch. xxxviii. § xxvii. 14.

prejudicial and detrimental to error, beneficial and friendly to truth. Such Christians, therefore, as discourage inquiry in matters of a religious nature, disparage their religion or their judgment. They give men ground of suspicion, that the Christian religion will not bear examination; or that they do not know it to be so excellent, and so well founded, as it is. For if they are persuaded that their religion is true and excellent, and supported by sufficient evidence, why are they afraid it should be tried and examined? If it have those properties, it must be the more respected the more it is examined and considered. I would therefore humbly recommend to these persons, for their improvement, the observation of the apostle's precepts, referred to likewise by Dionysius, and which are directed to such as were already Christians: *Prove all things: hold fast that which is good: abstain from all appearance of evil:* 1 Theff. v. 21. 22. that is, examine all things that are proposed to you; embrace that which is good, and reject every thing that is evil.

III. Alexandria ^k seems to have had a large share in the affliction of the plague that raged about this time in the Roman empire. In the fragments of the Festal epistle of Dionysius, ^l before-mentioned, there is a description of the very laudable temper and behaviour of the Christians in that time of distress; which I could gladly have inserted here, but shall content myself with this ^m reference to it.

I hope therefore it will be allowed me to transcribe a part of another letter, containing some account of the persecutions, and likewise taking some notice of the plague at that time. The letter just mentioned was written, as ⁿ was formerly shewn, in the year 263. But that which I now intend to make some extracts out of, is the letter to Domitius and Didymus, written in the time of the persecution under Valerian, in the year 259 or ° 260, certainly before Dionysius's return home, and before the peace granted to the church of Alexandria by Gallienus. Since therefore here likewise is notice taken of that pestilence, it must have raged a great while at Alexandria, or have broken out there more than once. I would premise one thing more for preventing scruples; that though this letter was written about the year 260, before the end of the persecution ordered by Valerian, yet Dionysius may possibly in the former part of it refer to the sufferings and fortitude of Christians under Decius. It is to this

^k Pestilens morbus multas totius orbis provincias occupavit, maximeque Alexandriam et Ægyptum, ut scribit Dionysius, et Cypriani de Mortalitate testis est liber. Euseb. Chron. p. 175. ^l See p. 62. ^m Vid. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 22, p. 268, 269. ⁿ See p. 62.

purpose: 'Moreover,' says ^p Eusebius, 'the same Dionysius, in his Letter to Domitius and Didymus, writes again of the persecution after this manner: "It is needless to mention the names of all our people that have suffered, since they are many, and most of them unknown to you. It may suffice therefore to assure you, that (D) persons of both sexes, and of every age and condition, and soldiers and country people, have been victorious in this combat, and been crowned; some by scourging, some by fire, others by the sword. Nevertheless, in all this space of time, some there are who do not yet appear to be acceptable to the Lord. Me, in particular, he seems pleased to reserve for some other season, according to the words of the prophet, *Is. xlix. 8. In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I accepted thee.*" Then, after a few words intervening, he says: "At present I have with me only Caius and Peter, deprived of the rest of the brethren." And soon afterwards: "Some have hid themselves in the city, that they may privately visit the brethren; as, Maximus, Dioscorus, Demetrius, and Lucius, presbyters: for Faustinus and Aquilla, being much known, travel up and down Egypt. The deacons that survive, after those that have died of the plague, are, Faustus, Eusebius, Chæremon: Eusebius, I say, whom God qualified from the beginning, and furnished with great resolution and ability, for fulfilling the office of ministration to the confessors in prison, and for burying the bodies of the perfect and blessed martyrs, not without the utmost peril. For to this very day the prefect does not cease to treat our people in the most cruel manner, killing some, torturing others, making others pine away in fetters and dungeons; forbidding any one to be admitted to them, and strictly inquiring likewise whether his orders be obeyed. Notwithstanding which, such is the courage and alacrity with which God inspires the brethren, the afflicted are not without the consolation suited to their exigence." So writes Dionysius.'

What follows in Eusebius appears very affecting. 'It is ought to be observed,' says he, 'that Eusebius, whom Dionysius mentions as deacon, was afterwards bishop of Laodicea in Syria. Maximus, whom he speaks of as presbyter at that time, succeeded Dionysius himself in the care of the brethren at Alexandria. And Faustus, who had then the honour to be a

^p l. 7. cap. vi. p. 260. C. D. 261. (D) Here may be a reference to some things that happened under the Decian persecution. Comp. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 40, 41, 42. ¹ ibid. p. 261. C.

‘confessor together with Dionysius, having been preserved to the persecution in (E) our time, when he was very old, and full of years, was perfected by martyrdom, having been beheaded.’

Certainly these were honest and upright men. They were fully persuaded of the truth of the Christian religion; for they suffered for it, and yet continued to make a profession of it, till their life was taken away. By such as these was the Christian doctrine received at that time, and by such has it been delivered down to us.

IV. I shall in the next place give some account of the several controversies before-mentioned, and the part Dionysius had in them.

Cornelius was chosen bishop of Rome in ^r June 251. Soon after, Novatus, presbyter in the same church, got himself also ordained bishop of Rome: and beside the schism he is charged with on that account, he set up a rigid notion against all who had lapsed in time of persecution, not allowing any such to be again restored to the communion of the church, whatever tokens of repentance they might shew: whereas all other Christians in general allowed those who had fallen to be restored to such communion, either in the approach of death, or when they had performed penance, proportioned to the nature or aggravations of the fault they had been guilty of.

Of the part which Dionysius acted upon this occasion, and in this controversy, there is the following account in Eusebius’s Ecclesiastical History. He ^s wrote a letter to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, who is supposed to have been too favourable to Novatus, or Novatian, as he is often called, and his rigid sentiments concerning the discipline of the church. Basnage ^t thinks it probable that this letter was written some time before the end of the year 251. Dionysius also sent a letter to Novatus himself, in answer, as is supposed, to one received from him. Eusebius has preserved a copy of that epistle. The letter to Fabius seems to have been upon the point of penance, confuting Novatus’s rigid notions relating to that matter. The letter to Novatus himself concerns rather his schism. Novatus, as Eusebius ^u says, endeavoured to cast the blame of all he had done upon some of the brethren, by whom, as he pretended, he had been constrained to take the course he did, to whom he had yielded unwillingly, and as it were by compulsion. The answer therefore re-

(E) Dioclesian’s persecution. ^r Vid. Pag. 251. n. xix. ^s Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 42, 43, 44. ^t Vid. Basnage, 247. n. vii. init. ^u Euseb. ib. cap. 45. in.

turned by our bishop was this: 'Dionysius * sends greeting to
 'our brother Novatus. If, as you say, you have been ordained
 'unwillingly, you will make it appear by a voluntary resigna-
 'tion; for a man should undergo any thing rather than divide
 'the church of God; and the martyrdom you should suffer ra-
 'ther than make a schism would in my opinion be more glori-
 'ous than a martyrdom for not sacrificing to idols: for in this
 'case a man suffers for his own soul only, in the other for the sake
 'of the whole church. Now, therefore, if you can persuade or
 'oblige the brethren to reunite, your merit will exceed your
 'crime. This will be no longer imputed to you; that will be
 'applauded. If there remain any whom you cannot persuade,
 'however save your own soul.'

Dionysius must have written many letters upon this argument:
 for, as Eusebius * adds immediately after having transcribed that
 letter to Novatus, 'he also wrote a letter to the brethren through-
 'out Egypt concerning repentance, in which he delivered his
 'opinion concerning those that had fallen, distinguishing the se-
 'veral degrees of offences. There is likewise a distinct piece
 'concerning repentance, directed in particular to Conon, bishop
 'of Hermopolis, and a letter of reproof to his flock at Alexan-
 'dria. Here may be mentioned his epistle concerning martyr-
 'dom, sent to Origen. He wrote also to the brethren of
 'Laodicea, over whom presided Thelymidres as bishop; and
 'in like manner concerning repentance to the Armenians,
 'who had Meruzanes for their bishop. He wrote also to Cor-
 'nelius, bishop of Rome, after he had received his letter against
 'Novatus; in which he informs him, that he had been invited
 'by Helenus, bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia, and by others with
 'him, and by Firmilian of Cappadocia, and Theoctistus of Pa-
 'lestine, to meet them at a synod at Antioch, where some en-
 'deavoured to establish the schism of Novatus. He writes like-
 'wise, that he had heard that Fabius was dead, and that Deme-
 'trian was appointed bishop of Antioch in his room. There is
 'another letter of his sent to the brethren at Rome by Hippo-
 'litus, concerning the office of a deacon; another letter to the
 'same persons concerning peace and repentance; and again
 'another to the confessors of the same city, who still favoured
 'the opinion of Novatus; and two more to the same persons,
 'after they were returned to the church. He wrote, as Eusebius
 'there adds, many other letters to divers persons, from which

* ap. Euseb. L. vi. cap. 45. Hier. De V. I. cap. 69.

x Ibid. cap. 46.

‘ they who are curious to inquire after his labours, (as certainly ‘ many are,) may receive much profit.’

The forementioned letter to Cornelius is supposed to ^y have been written in 252, and most of the others relating to penance, and to Novatianism, in the same or the foregoing year. The letter to Origen was ^z probably written in the Decian persecution, in the year 250, to comfort, animate and encourage him when ^a in prison.

Finally, in a letter to Stephen, bishop of Rome, (probably ^b written in 256;) as Eusebius assures us, he acquaints him, that all ‘ the churches, having rejected the novel principles of Novatus, with regard to the treatment of such as had lapsed, were come to an unanimous agreement with each other. ‘ Know, ‘ brother,’ says ^d he, ‘ that all the churches of the East, which before were divided, are now united.’ And a little lower he says: ‘ And all the presidents of the churches are of one mind, ‘ and are beyond measure filled with joy for the unexpected ‘ peace: I mean Demetrian, bishop of Antioch; Theoctistus of ‘ Cæsarea; Mezabanes, bishop of Ælia since the death of Alexander; Marinus, of Tyre; Heliodorus of Laodicea, successor of ‘ Thelymidres; Helenus of Tarsus; and all the churches of Cilicia; ‘ and Firmilian, and all Cappadocia with him: for I mention the ‘ names of the principal bishops (F) only, that I may not be troublesome by the too great length of my letter. But I would be understood to mean the churches throughout all the provinces of ‘ Syria and Arabia, whom ‘ you often relieve in distress, and to ‘ whom you have lately written: as also, Mesopotamia, Pontus, ‘ and Bithynia. And, in a word, all every where rejoice and praise ‘ God for the unanimity and brotherly love which reign among ‘ them.’

V. It is not easy to say the exact time of Dionysius’s dispute about the millennium. But it was occasioned by the writings of Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, then dead; who flourished, as ^c Cave thinks, about 244, or, as ^e Basnage, about 241. Baronius ^h supposed this opinion to have given disturbance to the church in 263. Accordingly, it is spoken of by ⁱ Pagi at the same time. Tillemont ^k says, that Valerian, who begun his reign about the middle of the year 253, was very favourable to the Christians, till the year 257. These first three years of his reign, in which

^y Basnag. Ann. 247. n. vii. ^z Id. ib.

^a Vid. Euseb. L. 6. c. 39. ^b Vid. Basn.

ut supra. et Conf. Pagi Crit. An. 256. n.

xiv. xv. ^c Euf. l. vii. cap. iv. ^d Euf.

ib. cap. v. init. (F) This letter of our

Dionysius, written in the year 256, is an authentic witness of the vast progress which

Christianity had made in the East. It had had a like progress in the West. ^e *οἱ*

ἐπαρχικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι, καὶ οἱς οὗτοι ἐπιστάται. ibid. p. 252. A. ^f Cav. H. L. P. i.

p. 86. ^g Ann. 240. n. viii. ^h Ann.

264. n. i. et seq. ⁱ Crit. An. 263. ii.

^k St. Den. d’Alex. Art. ix.

it seems that Egypt, as well as the church, enjoyed great tranquillity, are therefore very proper for considering the affair of Nepos; the time of which we do not know, but which seems to suit a time of peace. So that learned writer just mentioned.

Nepos wrote a book entitled, A Confutation of the Allegorists. This being in great repute with some persons, who had too carnal notions of an expected millennium, Dionysius wrote a confutation of it in two books, entitled, Concerning the Promises. St. Jerom makes particular mention of this work in his 'Catalogue. I say no more of this matter here; I shall give a particular account of it from Eusebius, in the article of Dionysius's testimony to the books of scripture.

VI. When there arose a controversy between Stephen of Rome, and Cyprian of Carthage, about the baptism of heretics, Dionysius^m wrote a letter to Stephen. It is the same letter, a part of which was before transcribed, where Dionysius informs Stephen of the peace of the eastern churches, with regard to Novatianism, and is supposed to have been written in 256. The second letter concerning baptism was sent to Xystus, or Sixtus, successor of Stephen, asⁿ Eusebius expressly says. This letter must have been written in 257, or 258. And herein, as^o Eusebius likewise informs us, Dionysius referred to his letter to Stephen, and then adds: 'I^p wrote likewise to our beloved and fellow-presbyters, Dionysius and Philemon, who were of the same mind with Stephen, and wrote to me upon that question. To them I wrote formerly in a few words, but now largely.' And the letter now sent to Philemon I suppose to be that which Eusebius afterwards^q calls Dionysius's third letter upon baptism. The fourth, concerning the same matter, according to Eusebius's way of computing, is that sent to Dionysius, then presbyter, afterwards bishop of Rome. Jerom^s likewise reckons two distinct letters, one to Philemon, another to Dionysius. In this letter, as Eusebius says, Dionysius writes of Novatus to this purpose; 'We^t do with good reason abominate Novatus, who has divided the church, and drawn some of the brethren into impiety and blasphemy, and has calumniated our most gracious

^l Et duo libri adversum Nepotem episcopum, qui mille annorum corporale regnum suis scriptis asseverat: in quibus et de Apocalypsi Joannis diligentissime disputat. De V. I. cap. 69. ^m Euseb. I. vii. cap. 4, 5. ⁿ ταῦτα δευτεραν ο Διονυσιος

περι βαπτισματος χαραξας επιστολην. κ. λ. ib. p. 252. A. ^o Ib. A. B. ^p Ib. C.

^q και η τε τριτη δε των περι βαπτισματος,

η Φιλημονι τω κατα Ρωμην πρεσβυτερω ο αυτος γραφει διονυσιος, ib. cap. vii. in.

^r η τεταρτη αυτη περι βαπτισματος επιστολην προς τον κατα ρωμην συγραφη διονυσιον, τοτε μιν πρεσβευη ηξιωμενον. κ. λ. ib. p. 254. A.

^s Et ad Philemonem et ad Dionysium Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyteros, duas epistolas. De V. I. cap. 69. ^t Ibid, cap. viii.

'Lord Jesus Christ as unmerciful.' Afterwards Eusebius adds, 'that ^u Dionysius's fifth letter concerning baptism was written 'to Xystus, bishop of the Romans:' out of which Eusebius transcribes a passage relating to that matter, and then adds; 'There ^w is extant yet another letter of the same person concerning 'baptism, as from himself and his people, to Xystus and the 'church at Rome, in which he treats largely of this question.' Thus, according to Eusebius, there were at least six letters of Dionysius upon this point sent to Rome; three of which were to Xystus, though Jerom in his Catalogue, ^x among the works of Dionysius, reckons but two letters to that bishop. And immediately after the words last cited from Eusebius, it is added, that ^{xx} beside these there is another letter of this Dionysius to Dionysius of Rome, concerning one Lucian.

What was our Dionysius's own opinion in this controversy is not certainly known. Jerom says plainly, 'that ^y Dionysius, 'agreeing with Cyprian and the African synod in the opinion 'of rebaptising heretics, wrote to divers persons a great number 'of letters still extant.' And ^z Valesius and ^a Pagi allow, that Dionysius ^b was somewhat inclined to Cyprian's side of the question. Nevertheless, there are some learned moderns who venture to contradict St. Jerom; though one would think he might be better able to judge of this matter than we at this time, who have so small a part of those letters come down to us. The learned moderns whom I mean are ^c Du Pin and ^d Basnage, whom any may consult that are so disposed. However it may be observed here, that the former of those two learned writers says, 'Dionysius was of opinion that all churches should be at liberty to 'follow their own customs. Some only required heretics to abjure their errors upon returning to the church: others, as the 'Africans, and divers churches in the East, had a different method of receiving heretics, not without baptism; and every one 'should do as he saw fit. This,' says Du Pin, 'was Dionysius's 'sentiment; and Jerom is to blame for saying that he sided with 'Cyprian.' Cave ^e expresseth himself after this manner; 'That 'Dionysius, together with Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Capadocia, and a great many others in the East, stood on Cyprian's

^u Ib. cap. ix. in.^w Ib. p. 255. C.

256. n. xii.

^b In Afrorum et Orient.^x Ad Xystum, qui Stephano successerat, duas epistolas. ib. cap. 69.^{xx} Euseb.

talium sententiam magis propendebat.

ib. p. 255. C.

^y Hic in Cypriani at^c Bibl. Tom. i. p. 188.^d Basn. A.

Africae synodi dogma consentiens de hæreticis rebaptizandis ad diversos plurimas misit epistolas. De V. I. c. 69.

^z Vales.^e See Cave's Life of St. Dionysius of Alexandria, p. 289, in his History of the Lives of the Primitive Fathers.

An. in Euf. l. vii. c. v. p. 141.

^a A.

London, 1677.

side, maintaining that heretics ought to be baptised. But, however, he carried himself with great temper and moderation. Besides that, he engaged more as a mediator than a party, writing to pope Stephen to use moderation in the case; as he did also to Sixtus his successor, and most other bishops of that time.^g This may be the truest judgment; for Dionysius's moderation is manifest. He is ^f against excommunicating churches upon this account: but what was his own opinion any farther in this point, does not appear clearly from the fragments or history in Eusebius.

VII. In the first letter to Xystus before-mentioned, the second upon the subject of baptism, written in 257 or 258, Dionysius, as ^h Eusebius says, informs him of the great increase of the Sabellian heretics at that time, in these words: 'For as concerning the opinion now advanced in Ptolemais, a city of Pentapolis, which is full of impiety and blasphemy against God Almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; containing likewise much infidelity toward his only begotten Son, and the first begotten of every creature, the word that became man, and a stupid notion concerning the Holy Spirit; there having been brought to me letters from both parties, some also having come from thence to discourse with me; I sent thither some letters, written according to the ability which God has given me, wherein I have spoken largely. Herewith you receive copies of them.'

Afterwards, in another chapter, Eusebius speaks after this manner: 'Beside ^h these, there are many other epistles of Dionysius; as those against Sabellius, written to Ammon, bishop of Bernice; and that to Telephorus, and that to Euphranor; and again to Ammon and Euporus. He ⁱ composed likewise four other pieces upon the same subject, which he addressed to his namesake Dionysius of Rome.'

Concerning this matter, St. Jerom in his Catalogue ^k makes no additions: he only recites, as it were, the same words of Eusebius, or part of them at least; for he omits somewhat, and scarce expresseth himself so clearly as Eusebius. However, in another place, ^l he speaks again of four volumes of Dionysius against Sabellius.

^f Vid. Euf. H. E. L. vii. cap. v. p. 252. B. C. ^g Σημαιων δε εν ταυτη και περι των κατα σαβηλλιον αιρετικων ως κατ' αυτον επιπολαζοντων. κ. λ. H. E. L. vii. cap. 6. ^h L. vii. cap. 26. ⁱ συνταττει δε περι της αυτης υποθεσεως και αλλα τεσσαρα συγγραμματα, α τα κατα Ρωμην ομωνυμω Διονυσιω προσφωνει. ib. p. 277. A. ^k Et adversus Sabellium, et ad Ammonem Be-

ronices episcopum, et ad Telephorum, et ad Euphranorem, et quatuor libri ad Dionysium Romanæ urbis episcopum. De V. I. cap. 69. ^l Et Dionysium Alexandrinæ urbis episcopum, virum eruditissimum [scribit] contra Sabellium quatuor voluminibus disputantem, in Arianum dogma delabi. Hieron: adv. Ruf. l. 2. p. 409. m.

Sabellius, as is supposed, published his peculiar notions a little before ^m the year 257, ⁿ about 255, or ^o in 256. Dionysius's letter beforementioned to Xystus was written in 257 or 258. The books inscribed to Dionysius of Rome could not be sent to him before 259; probably ^p not till 260, or a short time after.

But Athanasius informs us of particulars omitted by both Eusebius and Jerom. It seems, some Arians of that time endeavoured to support their doctrine by some passages of Dionysius in his writings against Sabellius. This gave occasion for the Treatise, or rather Epistle of Athanasius concerning the opinion of Dionysius of Alexandria. Here then Athanasius writes to this purpose: 'In ^a Pentapolis, of the Upper Libya, at that time some ^b bishops went into the notions of Sabellius. . . . Dionysius hearing of it sent to them, admonishing them to renounce their ^c error. But they persisting in it, he was compelled to write that ^d epistle;' which the Arians made use of to support their doctrine. In this piece Athanasius often mentions the Letter ^e to Ammonius, and ^f the Letter to Euphranor and Ammonius; meaning, I suppose, either one and the same letter, or two letters, and the same that are mentioned by Eusebius.

Farther, Athanasius informs us, that after Dionysius had written that letter to Euphranor and Ammonius, ^g some ^h of the brethren of the church, of orthodox sentiments indeed, but without consulting him, that they might understand from himself ⁱ the true meaning of what he had written, went to Rome, and ^j accused him to his namesake Dionysius, bishop of Rome. . . . ^k who then wrote to Dionysius, to inform him of what had been ^l laid to his charge. He ^m soon replied, entitling his books a ⁿ Confutation and Apology.' Afterwards Athanasius calls this work ^o an Epistle. He likewise ^p quotes the second book of it. By this work, entitled in Athanasius a Confutation and Apology,

^m Il commença un peu avant l'an 257, à troubler la Pentapole, dans la Libye Cyrenaique, en combatant la distinction des trois personnes divines. Tillem. Saint Denys d' Alex. Art. xv. T. iv. P. ii. p. 595.

ⁿ Sabellius n' a commencé à decouvrir son heresie que vers l'an 255, dans le tems que l'eglise jouissoit de la paix sous Valerien. Tillem. Les Sabelliens. ibid. p. 531.

^o Vid. Basnag. 247. n. ix. 256. xv.

^p Vid. Basn. 247. n. ix.

^a εν πενταπολει της ανω λιβυης τηκαυτα τινες των επισκοπων εφωτησαν τα σαβελλιου. . . . τωτο μαθων διονυσιος. . . . επιμπει και συμβουλευει τοις αιτιοις παλσασθαι της κακοδοξιας ως δε ηκ επαυριτο. . . . ηαγκασθη προς την α-

ναιδιαν εκεινων γραφαι την τοιαυτην επιστολην, κ. λ. Athanas. de Sent. Dionys. § 5. p. 240. D. E. T. i. Bened.

^b η δι γραφας την προς Αμμωνιον επιστολην υποπτευθη, κ. λ. ib. p. 247. B.

^c οτως εκ αριανος ο διονυσιος, δια την προς ευφρανωρα και αμμωνιον κατα σαβελλιου επιστολην. p. 249. B. vid. etiam 251. C. 252. B. 261. C.

^d Ib. p. 252. B. C. Conf. eund. de Synodis, &c. p. 757, 758. ^e και αυτη γραφει ευθως αυτος, και επιγραφει τα βιβλια ελεγχει και απολογιας. ib. p. 252. C.

^f πρωτον μιν εν ελεγχει και απολογιας επιγραφει αυτην την επιστολην p. 253. A.

^g ορα παλιν πως εν τω δευτερω βιβλιω γραφει περι τωτων. p. 260. E.

P. 595.

or Accusation and Apology, I suppose to be intended the four pieces mentioned by Eusebius, as sent to Dionysius of Rome. For it is upon the same argument of Sabellianism, and sent to the same person. And though Athanasius in one place calleth it an Epistle, it appears from him to have consisted of several parts: and St. Basil quotes, as he expresseth himself, Dionysius's ¹ second Epistle to his namesake concerning the Confutation [or Accusation] and Apology. I think learned men do generally allow that ² Eusebius and Athanasius speak of the same writing.

The learned Benedictine, editor of St. Athanasius's works, in the advertisement before the Epistle of Athanasius, concerning the opinion of Dionysius, passeth a severe censure upon Eusebius; 'That, ² being an Arian, he has been silent about this history, because it is prejudicial to his cause.' But, in answer to this, several things may be said. First, Eusebius has made mention of Dionysius's writings against Sabellius, and particularly the pieces sent to Dionysius of Rome. Secondly, the design of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History might not lead him to give a more particular account of that affair, or of the works composed upon that occasion, or to transcribe any passages from them. Though Eusebius enlarges considerably upon Dionysius, he has not written a complete history of him, or his works. Besides, Jerom was no Arian, and yet he adds nothing to Eusebius; scarcely says so much. And Theodoret, having given an account of Sabellius himself, and his doctrine, adds only in these few words; 'Against ^b him wrote Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria.' Thirdly, allowing Eusebius to have been an Arian, he might be well enough satisfied with Dionysius's sentiments relating to the doctrine of the trinity: and there is at least as much reason to think he was so as not; for the great respect he has shewn for Dionysius affords an argument that he did not look upon him to be a man of the adverse side. It is plain from Athanasius, that some Arians did boast of Dionysius as a favourer of their doctrine: and why may not Eusebius form the same judgment of that great man? St. Basil, too, who is generally allowed to be

¹ . . . ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ πρὸς τὸν ὁμωνύμου
αὐτὴ ἐπιστολὴ περὶ ἐλεγχοῦ καὶ ἀπολογίας, κ.
λ. Bas. de Sp. S. cap. 72. p. 60. E. Tom.
3. Ben. ² Apud Eusebium vii. 26.
Hist. ubi librorum quatuor Dionysii Alex.
ad Dionysium Rom. adversus Sabellium
mentio, (ἐλεγχὸς καὶ ἀπολογία vocat Atha-
nasia) &c. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 264.
Conf. Cav. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 96. de Di-
onys. Alex. Tillemont, Les Sabelliens,
Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 535. ^a Quod

autem Eusebius, qui Dionysii gesta fufe fa-
tis prosequitur, ne verbum quidem de hac
historia fecerit; hinc sane augetur jam
vulgata de ipso, nimisque firma Arianis-
mi suspicio. Callide profecto tacuit hæ-
resi suæ exitiosam historiam: quam incau-
tius, ut ait Athanasius, alii Ariani, in su-
amque perniciem evulgârunt. ap. Athanas.
ib. p. 243. ^b κατὰ τὴν συνήθειαν δι-
ονυσίου ὁ τῆς ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐπισκοπὸς. Theod.
H. F. l. 2. cap. ix.

orthodox,

orthodox, says he ^c does not like every thing in Dionysius; that ^d he had given encouragement to the Anomœan doctrine; and ^e that he expresseth himself differently in speaking (g) of the trinity. Gennadius ^f calls Dionysius the fountain of Arianism, speaking very agreeably to St. Basil. Rufinus endeavours to defend Dionysius, by saying that ^g his works had been interpolated by the Arians; though this is now esteemed a groundless assertion by learned moderns, particularly by ^h bishop Bull. Undoubtedly the abovementioned piece of Athanasius is well written. It is the work of one who knew how to manage an argument to the best advantage. But, as Dionysius had expressed himself differently, there might be ground for debating what was his real sentiment. And Eusebius might think Dionysius held the same doctrine that he did. But it was not proper to be more particular than he has been in his Ecclesiastical History, where he was to write of general things, about which Christians for the most part were agreed; not of points controverted by the Christians of his time. This is said in defence of Eusebius, not of Arianism, with which I have no particular concern in this work, no more than Eusebius had in his Ecclesiastical History.

^c ἢ πάντα θαυμάζωμεν τ' ἀνδρός. Basil. Ep. ix. [al. 41.] p. 90. c. ^d σχεδόν γὰρ ταῦτοις τῆς οὐκ περιβρῦλλεμένης αἰσεύσεως, τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀνομοῖον λόγῳ, ὅτις ἐστίν, ὅσα γὰρ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώποις τὰ σπέρματα παρασχών. ibid. ^e καὶ παντοδαπὸς ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς συγγραμμασιν. ib. E. (g) After all these, and other things, said by St. Basil in his Letter to Maximus, it appears to me very strange, which is said by Theodoric Ruinart: Ex his fuit Basilus Magnus, qui in Epistola 41, ad Maximum philosophum proferre non dubitavit, Dionysium, quantum sibi liqueret, primum hominibus impietatis Anomœanæ seminaria præbuisse, non ex malitia quidem, sed quod Sabellio oblectari cuperet. At paullo ante fassus fuerat, se nullum ex Dionysii libris legisse. Venerunt quidem ad nos, inquit, illius admodum multa, libri vero nondum adsunt. Ruinart. Act. Mart. Sinc. et Select. p. 181. Here, to vindicate Dionysius's reputation upon this head, and invalidate the character which Basil gives him, Ruinart is pleased to say, that Basil had never read any of his works; whereas it is plain from that letter to Maximus, that Basil was well acquainted with them; otherwise he could not have spoken of them as he does. Nor is the passage, on which Ruinart builds that strange supposition, at all to his purpose. He understands Basil

according to the Latin translation of Godfrey Tilman: libri vero nondum adsunt. But if he had looked upon the Greek, he would have perceived that Basil only said he had not Dionysius's works with him, and therefore he could not send them to Maximus, as he had desired. ἢ παρὲς γὰρ μὴν τὰ βιβλία, διότι οὐκ ἀπεστεύλαμεν. Cæterum quæ postulas Dionysii scripta, venere quidem illa ad nos, et valde multa: sed non adsunt libri, et idcirco non misimus. Basil. T. 3. p. 90. B. C. Ed. Bened.

^f Nihil creatum aut serviens in trinitate credendum, ut vult Dionysius, fons Arii. Gennad. de Ecc. Dogm. cap. iv. ap. Aug. T. 8. Append. p. 75. Bened.

^g Dionysius quoque Alexandrinus episcopus eruditissimus assertor ecclesiasticæ fidei, cum in quamplurimis in tantum veritatem atque æqualitatem trinitatis defendat, ut imperitioribus quibusque etiam secundum Sabellium sensisse videatur: in his tamen libris suis, quos adversus Sabellii hæresim scribit, talia inveniuntur inserta, ut frequenter Ariani auctoritate ipsius se defendere conentur. Rufin. de Adult. libr. Orig. ad Macar. sub. fin. ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 250, 251. Bened. ^h Deceptus vero in eo est Rufinus Aquiliensis, dum existimavit Dionysii scripta ab Arianis fuisse corrupta et depravata, &c. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 2. cap. xi. p. 129.

Bishop

Bishop ⁱ Bull has no scruples here. But Basnage says, that ^k though Dionysius thought justly and orthodoxly, he expressed himself improperly. Le Moyne ^l likewise, another defender of Dionysius, says his expressions need and ought to be mollified to make sound divinity.

This is what we have to say of Dionysius's conduct in the affair of Sabellianism; which, as Eusebius informed us, spread greatly at that time in Egypt.

But before we leave this article it will not be improper to take some further notice of Sabellius and his opinions.

Dionysius himself, as ^m before quoted, speaks of the rise of that doctrine in Ptolemais, a city of Pentapolis. Theodoret says, Sabellius ⁿ was an African, [or Libyan,] of Pentapolis. St. Basil likewise calls ^o Sabellius a Libyan: and Isidore of Pelusium says Sabellianism ^p had it's rise in Libya.

With regard to his notions, Epiphanius says, 'that, ^q excepting a few things only, Sabellius agreed with the Noetians: 'that ^r Sabellius and his followers teach that the same is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; so that there are only three denominations in one hypostasis, [or subsistence;] or, as in man, body, 'soul, and spirit.' In that which is called his Recapitulation, Epiphanius says 'the ^s Sabellians agreed with the Noetians, 'except in this one thing, that they said the Father did not suffer.' This is Epiphanius's whole article concerning the Sabellians in that work.

Damascenus says 'The ^t Sabellians agree with Noetus, except 'that they do not say the Father suffered. They speak of the 'Word brought forth and again resumed.' This is the same as the Summary, or ^u Synopsis, of Epiphanius.

The last sentence is difficult to be rendered in our language. I am far from thinking there is any particular propriety or exactness in my translation; but it was necessary that I should put down some English words instead of the original. What I have translated 'the Word brought forth' might perhaps be as well

ⁱ Vid. Bull. *ibid.* ^k Rem quod attinet, de augustissimo trinitatis mysterio vera sensisse Dionysium existimamus; incommo- dam tamen duramque locutionem ipsius prorsus improbamus. Basn. Ann. 247. n. ix. ^l Cui licet quædam exciderint minus veritati congrua, ea sunt tamen benigniori interpretatione mollienda et condienda. Le Moyne *Notis ad Var. Sacr.* p. 236. ^m See p. 71. ⁿ Hæret. Fab. L. ii. cap. 9. ^o Bas. Ep. 207. [al. 63.] p. 210. A. ^p Lib. i. Ep. 247.

^q Hær. 62. n. i. p. 513. A. ^r τον αυτον ειναι πατερα, τον αυτον ειναι αγιον πνευμα' ως ειναι εν μια υποστασει τρεις ονομα- σιας, η ως εν ανθρωπω σωμα, και ψυχη, και πνευμα. κ. λ. *ib.* B. ^s τα ομοια νοητιανων δοξαζοντες, παρα τωτο μονον λεγουμεν γαρ μη πισπονηναι τον πατερα. Epiph. Anac. T. ii. p. 146. n. xvi. ^t οι τα ομοια νοητα δοξαζοντες, παρα το μη τον πατερα λε- γειν πισπονηναι' λεγοντες προφορικον και πα- λιν αναχιομενον τον λογον. J. Dam. de Hær. n. lxii. p. 296. ^u Vid. Epiph. T. i. p. 398.

rendered 'the Word pronounced, or uttered, spoken forth, shew-
'ed, or discovered.'

In order to judge of this matter, it should be observed that *logos* [word,] in the Greek language has two senses; reason, or thought, and speech. They therefore sometimes speak of *λογος ενδιαθετος*, inward, or internal *logos*, or word, that is, thought; and *λογος προφορικος*, outward, or declared *logos* or word, that is speech. With regard to God, therefore, the Word is either the reason, thought, wisdom, counsel, power of God within himself; or his reason, wisdom, power, displayed and manifested; or, in other words, the command, the will of God, active and effective. Beaufobre, speaking of this matter, and particularly of the sentiment of the Sabellians concerning the Word, expresseth himself thus: 'The * Word never proceeds out of the Father but as our
'reason proceeds, as I may say, out of us, when it makes known
'by words and commands what are our thoughts and our de-
'sires. So the Word, which was in Jesus Christ, is only a decla-
'rative Word, which manifested to Jesus the knowledge of sal-
'vation, and an operative Word, which conferred upon him
'miraculous power. It is only an operation of the Deity, a full
'effusion of the divine wisdom and power in the soul of our
'Lord.' So that learned writer.

Perhaps some may be of opinion that some ancient Christians by *λογος προφορικος*, outward word, when applied to our Saviour, endeavoured to express and explain *God was manifested in the flesh*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. Compare John i. 14. xvi. 28. Prov. viii. 25. If. iv. 11.

Epiphanius intimates, that the Sabellians embraced that which was their peculiar opinion out of a dread of polytheism: for, as he * says, when they met with other Christians, especially such as were unlearned, they would put this shrewd question to them; 'Well, good friends, what is our doctrine? Have we one god, 'or three gods?'

Philaster † calls Sabellius a disciple of Noetus: but possibly he meaneth no more than that, as to his doctrine, he agreed with or followed Noetus, who was more ancient. But I shall not stay

* Le verbe ne sort jamais du Pere que comme notre raison sort, pour ainsi dire, hors de nous, lorsqu'elle fait connoître, par des paroles et par des commandemens, quelles sont nos pensées et nos volentez. Ainsi le Verbe, qui a été en J. Christ, n'est qu'un Verbe declaratif, qui a manifesté à Jesus la science du salut, et un Verbe operatif, qui lui a conféré une puissance mi-

raculeuse. . . . Ce n'est qu'une operation de la Divinité, une pleine effusion de la sagesse et de la vertue divine dans l'ame du Seigneur. Beauf. Hist. de Manich. P. ii. l. 3. ch. 6. n. ix.

† . . . τῇ πνεύματι αὐτοῖς ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν ταύτην τὴν ἀν' ἡμῶν, ὡς ἔστιν ἡ αὐτὴν ἔχουσαν, ἢ τρεῖς θεοί. Epiph. Har. 62. n. ii. p. 514. B. † Phil. H. 54.

to transcribe him here, nor * Augustine, at large. The reader may remember that I some time ago quoted ** Augustine's article of the Sabellians in his book of Heresies.

St. Ambrose says, in short, ' that *** the error of Sabellius ' lay in confounding the Father and the Word.'

St. Basil represents Sabellius and the Sabellians as teaching ' the || Father, Son, and Spirit, to be three persons in one hypostasis,' or subsistence. To †* the like purpose Isidore of Pelusium.

If the author of the Conference between Zachæus and Apollonius may be relied upon, the †† Sabellians said, that by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament ought not to be understood a person, but a gift; being spoken of as given and received. They argued particularly, as he says, from John xx. 22, and Acts xix. 2.

Sabellianism must have been very agreeable to the apprehensions of many people. Eusebius * speaks of it's increasing very much in Egypt, when Dionysius of Alexandria opposed it. According to Athanasius, the occasion of Dionysius's writing upon that head was, ' that ^b some bishops of Africa followed the doctrine of Sabellius, and they prevailed to such a degree, that the ' Son of God was scarce any longer preached in the churches.' Perhaps this passage may give some ground to think that Sabellius himself was a bishop, though none of the authors I have quoted or referred to expressly say any such thing. Isidore, before cited, says, that ^c Sabellianism spread to a great degree. Epiphanius, in 375, says there ^d were then many of that opinion in Mesopotamia and at Rome. Tillemont ^e concludes that these people had a body of communion in 381, because the council of Constantinople ^f rejects their baptism. The frequent

* Aug. de Har. c. 41.

** See p. 11.

* Neque, ut Sabellius, Patrem confundamus et Verbum; ut eundem Patrem adseramus et Filium. Ambr. de Fide. l. 1. c. 1. T. ii. p. 445. A. Bened.

|| ο γὰρ ἐν πρᾶγμα πολυπροσώπων λεγὼν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ μίαν τῶν τριῶν τῆν ὑπόστασιν ἐκτιθίμενος. κ. λ. Bas. Ep. 210. al. 64. p. 315. A.

†* τῆν προσκυνητὴν καὶ μακαρίαν τριάδα μίαν τινα τριπροσώπων ὑπόστασιν ἐξελήρησιν. Isid. l. 1. Ep. 247. †† Credo teneas

in præcedente titulo prænotatum, a Sabellianis præcipue Sanctum Spiritum denegari, et donum potius quam donatorem impiorum traditionibus dici; malique hujus auctoritatem sacris vel maxime testimoniis usurpari, quia et dari legatur et accipi, Salvatore ad apostolos sic loquente: et in-

flans eis dixit; accipite Spiritum Sanctum. Quidam etiam discipulorum a Paulo interrogati, An accepistis Spiritum Sanctum? neque accepisse, nec si esset scire se, dixerunt. Consulta. Zach. et Apoll. l. 2. cap. 14. in. ap. Acherii Spicileg. T. x. p. 81. qto. ^a Euf. l. 7. c. 6. ^b . . .

τηνκαὶ τινες τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐφωτίσταν τὰ Σαβιλλιῶν καὶ τοσούτοις ἰχυσανταὶ τὰς ἐπινοίας, ὥς ολίγη διὰ μικροῦ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, κηρυττεῖσθαι τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆ Θεοῦ. De Sent. Dionys. p. 246. D. ^c ἡ Σαβιλλιῶν κακοποίησις, ἐκ λήθους ἀπαράστα, εἰς πολλὰς δι' κωμῆσας.

Isid. l. 1. Ep. 247. ^d Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐν τῇ Μισσῇ τῶν ποταμῶν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς μέσῃ τῆς Ρωμῆς τῇ αὐτῇ δογματικῇ ὑπαρχουσιν. Har. 62.

p. 513. B. ^e Les Sabelliens. p. 535.

^f Can. vii. Labb. T. ii. p. 951.

notice which †† Augustine takes of Sabellians, in his tracts and sermons to the people, is an argument that in his time there was some considerable number of persons who maintained this opinion.

Of the scriptures received by Sabellius, and others of his sentiments, we have the following informations. Epiphanius expressly says, that ^s they used all the scriptures of the Old and New Testament; and that there were some texts which they principally insisted on for the support of their doctrine. Nevertheless he afterwards adds, that ^h their whole error, and all the strength of it, is taken from some apocryphal writings, especially from the gospel according to the Egyptians. Moreover Epiphanius argues against them from many books of the New Testament, particularly ⁱ from the Acts of the Apostles, (ch. i. and vii.) and complains of them, not that they rejected scripture, but that ^k they did not understand the meaning of the scriptures†.

Theodoret's account of Sabellius is, 'that ⁱ he taught the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit to be one hypostasis, [subsistence,] and one person with three names; that he speaks of the same sometimes as Father, sometimes as Son, and sometimes as Holy Ghost; and says, that in the Old Testament he delivered the law as Father, and in the New dwelt among men, [or was incarnate] as the Son, and descended on the apostles as the Holy Spirit.' This passage confirms what Epiphanius said, that Sabellius received all the scriptures.

It appears likewise from the arguments of ^m Athanasius, and others, that the Sabellians received the holy scriptures as other Christians did.

I was obliged just now (H) to give a hint of the time of Sabellianism. I would here add ⁿ in the margin the sentiments of divers learned men upon that point.

†† I quoted some such passages from Augustine in Ch. XLI. p. 11. note z. They who are desirous of seeing more may consult the Index to T. iii. P. ii. and T. V. Ed. Bened. V. Sabelliani. ^g Κεχρηται δὲ ταῖς πασαις γραφαις παλαιας τε καὶ καινης διαθυης. κ. λ. ib. p. 513. D.

^h τῇ δὲ πασαις αὐτῶν πλῆκει, καὶ τῇ τῆς πλῆκας αὐτῶν δύναμει ἔχουσιν ἐξ ἀποκρυφῶν τιγῶν, μαλιστα ἀπο τῆ καλῆμενης Αἰγυπτίης Ευαγγελίῃ, ὡς τις το ὄνομα ἐτίθεντο τῷ. ib. p. 514. A. ⁱ p. 518. A. ^k μὴ νοήσας τῇ φωνῇ τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν. ib. B.

† Non existet evangelium Johannis, ne Sabellius discat: *Ego et Pater unum sumus.*

Joh. x. 30. Hilar. De Synod. n. lxxxv. p. 1199. A. ⁱ μίαν υποστάσιν ἔφασιν ὡσεὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα,

καὶ ἐν τριωνυμῶν προσωπῶν καὶ τὸν αὐτόν, ποτε μὲν ὡς πατέρα καλεῖ, ποτε δὲ ὡς υἱόν, ποτε δὲ ὡς ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ἐν μὲν τῇ παλαιᾷ, ὡς πατέρα νομοθετοῦσαι, ἐν δὲ τῇ καινῇ, ὡς υἱόν ἐνανθρωπήσαι, ὡς πνεῦμα δὲ ἅγιον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐπιφοιτῆσαι. Theodoret. H. Fab. l. 2. cap. 9. ^m Vid. Athan. de Sent. Dionys. p. 261, 262. et Or. iv. contr. Arian. p. 636. E. F. 637. T. i. Bened.

(H) See p. 72. ⁿ Sed Libycus [Sabellius] ab illo Pentapolitano neutiquam diversus est, qui hæresim præceptoris sui

VIII. Before Dionysius died there arose another dispute of a like nature about the doctrine of the trinity. The principal person concerned herein was Paul of Samosata, who had been bishop of Antioch from ° about the year 260. We have already had divers references to this affair. I think it may now be proper to take Eusebius's account of it pretty much at length.

Says our ecclesiastical historian, ' Xystus, ^p bishop of the church of Rome, was succeeded by Dionysius of the same name with the bishop of Alexandria. About the same time Demetrian (1), bishop of Antioch, dying, Paul of Samosata succeeded him in the episcopate of that city. He ^q having a low and abstract opinion of Christ, contrary to the doctrine of the church, as if he had been no more than a man, a synod was appointed. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, when invited, excused his coming thither on account of his age and bodily infirmity: however, he sent a letter containing his opinion upon the point in question. The rest of the pastors of the churches from all parts hastened to Antioch, and were convened there as against a destroyer of the flock of Christ. The ^r most eminent of which were Firmilian, bishop of the church of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; Gregory and Athenodorus, brothers, pastors of the churches in Pontus: and, beside these, Helenus, bishop of the church in Tarsus; and Nicomas, of Iconium; Hymenæus, bishop of the church at Jerusalem; Theotecnus, bishop of Cæsarea in the same country; Maximus, who with great reputation presided over the brethren at Bosra; with many others, beside presbyters and deacons. These had divers meetings, and in every assembly there were many questions and disputes: Paul of Samosata on the one hand endeavouring to conceal his heterodox notion, they on the other hand striving to detect and expose his heresy and blasphemy against Christ. In the meantime Dionysius dies, in the twelfth year of the reign of Gallienus, having been bishop of Alexandria seventeen years. His successor was Maximus. Gallienus, having reigned fifteen years, was succeeded by Claudius: he having been emperor

Noeti diffeminare latius cepit A. C. 257, ut notarunt Benedictini notis ad S. Ambrosium T. ii. p. 445. [circiter annum 257.] Petav. Dogm. Theol. Tom. ii. p. 33. seq. et Rev. Christianus Wormius in Historia Sabellianismi edita Francof. 1698, capite 3. Idem de Marcello Ancyrano videndus, capite 5. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. 23. Tom viii. p. 335. Conf. Philastr. de Har. n. liv. p. 108. not. ^a Ed. Fabric.

° Vid. Pagi 261. num. vi. H. E. l. 7. cap. 27.

^p Euf.

(1) Demetrian had succeeded Fabius in 252, and was succeeded by Paul in 260. Vid. Pagi 261. n. vi. Basnag. 264. n. iii. ^q τὴν δι' ταπεινὰ καὶ χαμαιπαιτὴ περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς διδασκαλίας φρονησαντος, ὡς κοινὴ τῆς φύσεως ἀνθρώπου γινόμενα. ib. p. 277. C. ^r ib. cap. 28,

' two

‘two years, was succeeded by Aurelian. In ‘his time the last ‘synod was convened, consisting of a very great number of bishops.’ In this synod, as Eusebius proceeds to relate, Paul was evidently convicted of the heresy laid to his charge, and was excommunicated from the whole catholic church under heaven. The chief author of the conviction and condemnation of Paul was Malchion, presbyter in the church at Antioch. ‘The ‘pastors of the churches, then assembled together, with one ‘consent wrote an epistle to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, and ‘Maximus, bishop of Alexandria, which was also sent to the ‘churches all over the provinces.’ In this epistle, written in the name of Helenus, and ‘the other bishops, and of the presbyters and deacons and the churches of God, an ‘account is given of their own labour and pains, of the perverse and obstinate heresy of Paul, their convictions of Paul, and conferences with him, and of his life and morals. Here the fathers of this council say ‘they had sent to many bishops of the remotest provinces to ‘come to their assistance upon this occasion; particularly to ‘Dionysius of Alexandria, and Firmilian of Cappadocia, men ‘of blessed memory: that the former had sent a letter to Antioch, but did not so much as vouchsafe a salutation to the author of that heresy: nor did he write to him by name, but to ‘the whole church [of Antioch]; of which letter we here subjoin a copy.’ Firmilian, they say, had been twice at Antioch; and condemned, as they are well assured, Paul’s novel doctrine. ‘But, ‘believing and hoping the matter might be determined without bringing any reproach upon the Christian religion, he ‘deferred the sentence, being deceived,’ as they say, ‘by him ‘who had denied his God and Lord: and he was willing to come ‘once more to Antioch; but when he was got as far as Tarsus ‘he there died.’ The ‘council then proceeds, blackening Paul’s character, charging him with pride, avarice, exaction, an exorbitant love of praise and applause from all sorts of people. They say ‘that ‘he accepted secular dignities, and chose rather to be ‘considered as a judge [or officer of the revenue] than a bishop. He has been used to walk through the high streets, re-

‘ Cap. 29.

‘ Cap. 30.

“ . . . και

οι λοιποι παντες οι συν ημιν παροικηντες τας
εγγυς πολεις εβη επισκοποι και πρεσβυτεροι
και διακονοι, και αι εκκλησαι τη Θεω, αγα-
πωντοις αδελφοις ην κυριω χαιριν. p. 279. C.
‘ την αυτων σπηδην τοις πασι φανραν καθισ-
ταντες, και τη Παυλω την διαστροφον ετεροδου-
ξαι, ελεγχουσ τε και ρωτησεις ας προς αυτοι ανα-
κεινηκασι, και ετι τον παντα βιον τε και τρο-

πον τη ανδρος δινημνοι. *ibid.* p. 279. B.

‘ επαγγελαμεν δε μελαθροισθαι, πιστω-
σας και ελπισας ανευ τινος περι τον λογον λαι-
δοριας τοπραγμα εις διοι κατασπισθαι απ-
βαλετο. κ. λ. *ib.* p. 280. A. ‘ *ib.* p.
280. B. C. D. 281, 282. A. B. ‘ κοσ-
μικα αξιωματα υποδυμενος, και δεκτηρις
μαλλον η επισκοπος θελων καλυσθαι. p.
280. C.

‘ ceiving

ceiving letters, and dictating answers as he went along, attended by a great number of people as his guards, some going before, others following him. It is not necessary,' they say, 'to insist on his vain-glorious behaviour in the ecclesiastical assemblies, where he affects all imaginary pomp proper to amaze and astonish weak ignorant people: for he has erected to himself a tribunal and lofty throne, not like a disciple of Christ, but after the manner of civil magistrates, with a closter, as he calls it. It has been usual for him also to clap his hand upon his thigh, and stamp with his feet. And †† if there are any who do not applaud him, nor, as it is customary in the theatre, shake their handkerchiefs, nor make loud acclamations, nor leap up and down as some of his creatures do, but^a hear with a composed attention and reverence, as becometh the house of God, he reproveth and abuseth them.' Afterwards they insinuate, that from views of interest he neglected to keep up a strict discipline among his clergy. 'What^b shall we say

†† An excessive fondness for praise and commendation is far from being justifiable in any man. But, if Paul's whole fault consisted only in receiving and encouraging applauses and acclamations, when he spoke in public, the fathers of the council may be reckoned to have aggravated to a great degree; for it is certain that these things were common in church assemblies in the fourth and fifth, and following centuries. The passages of authors relating to this matter are too numerous to be inserted or referred to in this place. It has been observed by some learned moderns, that Chrysostom, a man of a severe temper, reprov'd and checked those acclamations, but that Augustine received them very willingly. *Ac videtur admirandæ sanctitatis vir B. Augustinus eum morem tulisse non invitatus, atque adeo non improbasse: quod ex libro iv. de Doctrina Christiana, cap. 26. aliisque locis licet intelligere.* Non ita Joannes Chrysostomus: qui vir divinus, ut erat austeriore ingenio, morem tot seculorum improbavit damnavitque. *Id. Casaub. Not. in Vulcat. Gallicani Avid. Cass. cap. 13. p. 467. Conf. Ferrar. lib. v. cap. 2.* There is scarce any kind of acclamation or applause here mentioned by this council but was in use in Chrysostom's time. The people applauded his sermons by shaking their loose garments, moving their plumes, waving their handkerchiefs. *Vid. Ferrar. l. v. c. 9.* Jerom reminds Vigilantius that, when he preached upon

the resurrection, Vigilantius himself had applauded him with hands and feet, leaping up and down, and crying out orthodox. *Recordare quæso illius diei, quando me de resurrectione et veritate corporis prædicante, ex latere subsaltabas, et plaudebas manu et applodebas pedem, et orthodoxum conclamabas. Ad Vigilant. Ep. 36. al. 75. p. 277. m.* In another place Jerom speaks of his being present at a sermon where the people applauded a certain interpretation of a text by stamping with the feet: *Scio me audisse quemdam de hoc loco in ecclesia disputantem, . . . certe tunc in populo dicta placuerunt, et quodam plausu ac tripudio sunt excepta. In Ep. ad Eph. cap. 5. 14.* It appears from Augustine that the acclamations of the people were very customary in Africa: *Unde autem crebro et multum acclamatur ita dicentibus, &c. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. l. 4. c. 26.* How can it then be thought strange by any, that this practice should prevail in the East, where it had it's original? Concerning the acclamations of the ancients, may be seen, beside others, *Fr. Ferrarius de Veterum Acclam. et Plausu; Suicer. Thef. V. Κροτος; J. Bingham Antiquities of the Christian Church, B. xiv. ch. 4. § xxvii. Casaub. ut supra; Neocori Bibl. Librorum Novorum. p. 18, &c. A. D. 1697.*

^a τοὺς δ' ἐν ὧς ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ συμπροσκυνῶντες, καὶ εὐτακτῶς ἀκροῦνται, ἐπιτίμῳ καὶ ὑπερβῶν. p. 281. A. ^b τὰς συνιστάσας αὐτὰ γυναικας, ὡς ἀποχρῆς οὐνομαζήσῃ. κ. λ. ib. C.

‘ of his * * subintroduced women, as the Antiochians call them, and of those belonging to his presbyters and deacons ? with regard to whom he conceals and tolerates this, and many other crimes, which he knows very well, and of which he has convicted them, that he may keep them in dependence; and that, standing in fear of him on their own account, they may not dare to bring accusations against him for his unrighteous actions: moreover, he has enriched them; for which reason he is beloved and admired by men of covetous and worldly dispositions. But why do we write these things ? We are persuaded, brethren, that a bishop and all the clergy are bound to give the people an example of all good works. And we are not ignorant, that by introducing women some have fallen into sin, and others have been suspected. Although therefore it should be granted, that he has done nothing contrary to modesty, yet the very suspicion that arises from such a practice ought to be guarded against, for fear of giving offence or a bad example to any. For how can he reprove another, or admonish another not to ^d converse frequently with a woman, and to take heed lest he slip, as ^e it is written; who, though he has sent away one, still has two in his house that are handsome and in the flower of their age; whom he likewise carries about with him wherever he goes; at the same time living well, and indulging himself in a plentiful diet?’ At ^a the close of the epistle they say; ‘ Having therefore excommunicated this contumacious enemy of God, we have been obliged to ordain another

* * According to this account, Paul’s conduct was not exemplary, scarce reputable; but yet I am apt to think it was not criminal. The women here spoken of were not wives, nor concubines, but persons maintained as objects of charity, or else for the sake of domestic affairs. The thing was disliked by many, but nevertheless it was practised by some virtuous ecclesiastics. Vid. Epiphani. Hær. 63. n. ii. Cyprian. ad Pompon. Ep. 62. al. 4. It seems that Paul was not the first person who begun this practice at Antioch. This may be argued from the name by which the Antiochians called such women, which appears to have been then common and well known. And as much might be argued from some other considerations. That Paul was innocent, or free from crime, is probable, in that the fathers of the council do not charge him directly with unchastity or immodesty; which they would not have failed to do if there had been any ground for it, as we may be assured from the tem-

per of the composer or composers of this Synodical epistle: and I think that Paul’s open way of acting, without any reserve, must be of great use to prevent suspicion, or to remove it if it should arise in the mind of any one. The third canon of the council of Nice in 325 is to this purpose: ‘ That no bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, or any other of the clergy, should have an introduced woman, unless she be a mother, or sister, or aunt, or however a person liable to no suspicion.’ Vid. Mosheim. de Reb. Christian. p. 703, 704.

^c ως ει και δοιη τις το μηδεν ασιλγης ποιησιν. p. 281. D. ^d . . . μη συγκαταβαιναι επιπλεον εις ταυτον γυναικι μη ολισθη φυλαττομενον, ως γιγγρασται. p. 282. A.

^e Valesius thinks the council intends somewhat in the xxvth chapter of the book of Ecclesiasticus: but it does not clearly appear to me what text is here referred to. Intelligit locum qui habetur in cap. 25, Ecclesiastici. Valef. in Euseb. p. 257. n.

^a p. 282. B. C.

‘ bishop

‘bishop in his stead in the catholic church, and, as we are persuaded, not without the providence of God. The person we have ordained is son of Demetrian, of blessed memory, who formerly presided so well in this see, by name Domnus, a man endowed with all the accomplishments requisite in a bishop. To him therefore you are to write. Paul, having fallen from the faith and the episcopate,’ as Eusebius adds, ‘Domnus took upon him the care of the church of Antioch. But when Paul refused to leave the house of the church, a petition having been presented to the emperor Aurelian, he rightly determined the matter, giving orders that the house should be delivered to them, to whom the bishops of the Christian religion in Italy and at Rome should write. Thus the forementioned person, with the greatest disgrace, was thrust out of the church by the secular power.’

So writes Eusebius. There were therefore ‘at least two councils at Antioch upon this occasion; one, at which Firmilian was present, when Dionysius likewise was living, and sent a letter, supposed to have been convened in 264; another, and the last, when Paul was excommunicated, computed to have been held near the end of 269, and beginning of 270. Eusebius indeed seems to say, that the last council was held in the time of Aurelian, who did not begin his reign before November 270; whereas this council most probably was begun and ended in the time of Claudius. For the synodical epistle is sent to Dionysius of Rome, who died in December 269, and must therefore have been drawn up before the news of his death arrived at Antioch. But Paul, though excommunicated by the council in 269 or 270, could not be removed till 272 or 273, after Aurelian be-

^b Ἀλλὰ γὰρ μηδὲν ἐκτετακέναι τὴν Πάυλῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οἰκὴν βελόντος, βασιλεὺς ἐπιτυχθεὶς Αὐρηλιανὸς, αἰσιωτάτα περὶ τὴν πρακτικὴν διέκρισιν, τοῖς τοῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν τοῦ οἴκου, οἷς ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ρωμαίων πόλιν ἐπισκοποῦσι τὸ δόγματος ἐπιστάται. Οὕτω δὲ οὗτος ὁ ἀποδηλώσας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας αἰσχυνθεὶς, ὑπὸ τῆς κοσμικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐξελήνθηται τῆς ἐκκλησίας. *ib. p. 282. D.*

^c Ainsi il faut admettre trois conciles au moins sur cette affaire, celui qui la commença à la fin de l'an 264. Un second, dont on ignore le tems; et le dernier, qui la termina à la fin de 269, ou fort peu après. Tillem. Paul de Samosate Art. iv. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 624. Conf. Basn. A. 264. n. vi.

^d Secunda Synodus Antiochena adversus Paulum Samosatenum celebrata est autumnano anni ducentesimi

sexagesimi noni, sequentique continuata; quod colligitur ex epistola Synodica, quam episcopi ad Dionysium Romanum pontificem scripsere. Dionysius autem, ut mox videbimus, die vicesima octava Decembris illius anni ad Deum migravit. Quare hæc Synodus ad eum annum retrahenda. Pagi Crit. in Bar. A. 271. ii. Conf. Tillemont. Paul. de Sam. p. 625, 626. ^e Vid. Pagi 270. n. iii.

^f Hæstenus creditum fuit, Synodum hanc, Aureliano imperante, habitam fuisse; nisi quod Valesius in notis Eusebianis eam partim sub Claudio, partim sub Aureliano celebratam autumavit. Sed principatus Aureliani initio temporis suo reddito constat, illam Claudio imperante inchoatam et finitam, &c. Pagi 271. n. iii. vid. Till. *ib.* 625, 626. ^g Sed Paulus anno tantum 273, quo Zenobia ab Aureli-

came master of that country, upon the conquest of Zenobia. For Paul, as ^h is said, was favoured by Zenobia, and would not yield the house of the church, meaning either the bishop's dwelling-house, or the house in which the Christians held their assemblies, till compelled by the authority of Aurelian. And ⁱ perhaps Eusebius ought to be understood to mean as much; that when the council had been held under Claudius, it's result had not it's full effect till the reign of Aurelian, when Paul was actually thrust out of the church.

It may be best for us, in the next place, to take Theodoret's account of this matter, but briefly. He says, 'Paul ^k of Samosata was bishop of the church of Antioch. At that time Zenobia reigned. . . . He went into the heresy of Artemon, ^l in complaisance (κ) to her who followed Jewish notions.' Then, having mentioned the names of the principal bishops present at the first council, he adds; 'And at first they endeavoured by entreaties to induce Paul to renounce his false doctrine. But when he openly denied that he held any such opinion, and affirmed that he adhered to the apostolical doctrines; praising God for the common agreement, they returned to their several flocks. But when some time had passed, fame again published every where Paul's perversion. Nevertheless, even then, those excellent men did not immediately proceed to his excision; but first of all endeavoured to remedy the evil by letters. But when they saw the case to be desperate, they readily came again to Antioch; applying, however, still healing medicines, exhorting and admonishing the man, and reminding him of former promises and agreements. At length, he denying, and the accusers being positive, and engaging to make good their charge, they convened in council. Here Malachion, formerly a sophist, now honoured to be a presbyter, disputing with Paul, he ^m was convicted of saying that Christ was a man eminently favoured with the divine grace. Then they unanimously pronounced sentence, striking him out of the sacred registers. But when he refused to yield, and retained the government of the church; informing Aurelian, who then reigned, of Paul's

anno capta, ab ecclesia penitus exturbatus; non vero eodem anno, ut videtur existimasse Baronius. Pagi ib. n. iv.

^h Ιεδοία ην Ζηνοβία, και Παυλος επροση της Σαμοσατης. Athan. Hist. Arian. n. 71. p. 386. D. Bened.

ⁱ Vid. Pagi 271. n. iii. iv. Conf. Tillem. ibid. note iv. sur Paul de Sam. p. 897.

^k Theodoret.

H. Fab. L. 2. cap. 8.

^l εις αρτημον

ρος αρετων, ταυτα νομιζων διατριβειν ενωπι τα ιουδαιων φρονεσας. ib. init. (κ) St.

Chrysostom speaks to the like purpose. ητω

και ταυτον γινωσκων την χαριζομενον, της σωτηριας φασιν αποδοσθαι ταυτε. Chrys. in Joh.

Hom. vii. p. 57. A.

^m εφωρθη, της Χριστου ανθρωπων λεγων θειας χαριτος διαφωριςτας ηξιωμενον. ib. p. 223. B.

obstinacy

'obstinacy, they petitioned him to expel him the church. And even an idolater judged it fit, that a man who refused to submit to the determination of those who were of the same religion should be separated from their communion.'

Thus ended that affair; in which Firmilian was shy of pronouncing any sentence, fearing some bad consequences of it, and that thereby a reproach might be brought upon the Christian church: and, in all probability, it must have made a great noise in the world at that time. But the presbyter Malchion having been disobliged, as it seems, could not be satisfied, till his bishop was removed. I do not justify Paul in withstanding the decree of the council: so far as I am able to judge, he ought to have yielded, for peace sake, and should have submitted to the determination of the majority; especially if the majority of his own people, the church of Antioch, concurred with the synod; which, however, I think is not certain. Nor do I absolutely blame †† the bishops of that time, who applied to a heathen emperor to expel one of their brethren out of the church, provided they freely allowed Paul and his followers to worship God, according to the best of their knowledge, in separate assemblies, as perhaps they did. Much less would I take upon me to judge of the reasons or policy of his imperial majesty's determination. But for the vast disgrace of being thrust out of the church by the secular power, I should think the justness of that remark of our ecclesiastical historian may be disputed. If Aurelian condemned Paul, Zenobia favoured him; and her protection may be reckoned no small honour, if she was so excellent a princess as fame proclaims her. A learned writer, who styles himself Phileleutherus Dubliniensis, has lately given Zenobia this short character: 'That ^a she was the greatest woman of her own, or perhaps of any other age.' To the many other things that have been said in her commendation, it may be added, that she was no persecutor. Du Pin ^o says; 'Of all the councils held in the first three ages, the most famous are the two councils of Antioch, assembled against Paul of Samosata, bishop of that city.' They must have been both held under Odenatus or Zenobia; the last undoubtedly in her time. And the numerous bishops, and other clergy, and all other Christian people, belonging to that

†† Bishops of that time, &c.] It does not certainly appear who those bishops were. They could not be the bishops assembled in council, by whom Paul was deposed; for their Synodical Epistle was drawn up in 269, or the beginning of 270,

soon after which the council broke up. But this application to Aurelian could not be made till 272 or 273. ^a See Reflections upon Polygamy; by Phileleuth Dublin. London: 1737. p. 188.

^o Nouv. Bib. T. i. p. 213.

council, had come to Antioch, and returned without hindrance or molestation. They likewise issued out their Synodical Epistle, and sent it abroad all over the provinces without control or opposition: for we have received no complaints of any obstruction whatever; no, though a sentence too had been pronounced against that princess's favourite divine. It is true, we do not know that she ratified that sentence; nor did she compel Paul to leave the house of the church. What were her reasons I cannot say: perhaps, being in the main of the same opinion with Paul, and being likewise a woman of solid virtue, she could not in conscience join with his adversaries. Possibly she was not satisfied that the fathers of the council had any proper authority out of their own dioceses; or there might be danger of disobliging a large part of her subjects, and she might be apprehensive of creating divisions among her own people: nay, she might not be fully convinced of her right to interpose in such ecclesiastical affairs. That these were the reasons of her conduct I do not affirm; but I make no question that her majesty was governed by reasons and considerations of no small importance.

After all, human judgments, unless impartial, and well informed of the point in debate, are of little value. And if Paul had been respected by Zenobia, he could look for no favour from Aurelian, let his merit be ever so distinguished, and his cause ever so just. There are, I suppose, few Christians but regret Aurelian's putting to death that incomparable critic Longinus; though it ought to be remembered, that ^p he died so nobly as to comfort those who lamented his calamity. Nor does Eusebius vindicate all Aurelian's resolutions; but, presently afterwards, when that emperor's favourable dispositions toward the Christians were altered, and he was preparing his edicts to be published against them, Eusebius plainly says, that ^q 'divine vengeance laid hold of him.'

Eusebius informs us, that upon this occasion were assembled ^r very many bishops: St. Athanasius ^s says, they were seventy in number; St. Hilary, ^t eighty. Some later writers may mention a larger number: but it may be supposed that ^u Athanasius, from whom Hilary differs very little, is as much to be depended on as any one. Perhaps they were between seventy and eighty.

One thing principally to be observed, as concerning the person whose history we are writing, is Dionysius's letter, containing

^p . . . καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ γενναίᾳς κινήσει τοῦ Λογγίνου, ὥστε καὶ σχετλιαζόντας ἐπὶ τῷ πατρὶ παραμυθεῖσθαι. Zosim. l. i. p. 659. v. 21, 22. ^q l. vii. cap. 30. p. 283. A. ^r πλείων

ὄρων ἐπισκοπῶν. ib. c. 29.

de Syn. p. 757. E. F.

p. 1200. B. ed Bened.

dictin. Not. in loc. Athanasii,

^s Athan.

^t Hilary. de Syn.

^u Vid. Bene-

his opinion upon the question, and sent by him at the time of the first council. It is mentioned, as we have seen, by Eusebius, and by the fathers assembled in the last council; and it was subjoined by them to their Synodical Epistle. It is also taken notice of by St. Jerom, who ^w says it was written by Dionysius a few days before his death. He likewise calls it an excellent epistle. Whether it be still extant will be considered hereafter.

In the fragments of the Synodical Epistle itself, preserved in Eusebius, and undoubtedly genuine, out of which I have already made large extracts, the fathers of the last council say, 'that ^a Paul had departed from the canon, or ^y rule (L) of faith.' They presently afterwards charge him with ^z esteeming *gain to be godliness*; referring to 1 Tim. vi. 5. But I need not stay to insist upon such references, or allusions to scripture.

Beside those fragments in Eusebius just mentioned, we have an ^a epistle written to Paul of Samosata in the name of Hymenæus, Theophilus, Theotecnus, Maximus, Proclus, and Bolanus. Baronius has inserted this epistle entire into his ^b Annals: and ^c Tillemont says, he does not know that the genuineness of it is contested by any one; but whereas Baronius ascribes it to the first synod, he thinks it more probable, with ^d Valefius, that it was written by the last council, at the beginning of their assembling, before Malchion had fully convicted Paul. Of this opinion too is ^e Pagi. But ^f Basnage thinks that, if it be genuine, it was written some time between the first and last council. However he denies it to be genuine, and alleges divers ^g arguments, which I refer to the reader's consideration. Du Pin ^h likewise declares it to be his opinion that this letter is supposititious.

I only observe therefore briefly, that in this epistle are cited many texts of scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, particularly ⁱ Luke i. 2. And ^k *the doctrine of the apostles, the law and the prophets, the Old and New Testament*, are more than once

^w Sed et adversus Paulum Samosatenum, ante paucos dies quam moreretur, insignis ejus fertur epistola; De V. I. cap. 69. fin.

^x αποσας τη καινος. . . H. E. l. 7. c. 30. p. 280. B. ^y Vid. Valef. Annot. p. 156.

(L) Compare ch. 12. Dionysius of Corinth, Vol. ii. chap.

12. ^z p. 280. C. ^a Vid. Concil. ap. Labb. T. i. p. 844, &c.

^b A. 266. n. iv. &c. ^c As before, art.

^d Ann. in Euf. p. 157.

C. D. ^e A. 265. n. iii. ^f A.

264. n. vi. ^g ib. n. vii. ^h Bibl. T. i. p. 214. Amst.

ⁱ Και ιχουμ παραδοθισαι, και τηρημειν εν τη καθολικη και αληθα εκκλησια μεχρι της σημερον ημερας εκ διαδοξης υπο των μακαριων αποστολων, οι και αυτοπται και υπηρεται γιγοισαι τε λεγει, καταγγελουμεν εκ νομου και προφητων, και της καινης διαθηκης, ταυτα εκθισθαι. Ep. mis. ad Paul. Sam. ap. Labb. Conc. T. i. p. 848. E.

^k εν τε παλαια και νεα διαθηκη γνωστοις ομολογημεν και κηρυττομεν. ^l ib. p. 845. A. Vid. etiam supra not. 1.

mentioned as the rule of judging concerning the controverted question.

Here some notice must be taken of Paul's opinions, according as we are informed of them in the accounts given by ancient writers; though, perhaps, we now have nothing remaining of Paul himself, or any of his followers.

Eusebius, as we have already seen, assures us, that ^l Paul had low and abject thoughts of Christ, as if he was no more than a man.' In another place of his Ecclesiastical History he says, that ^m Paul of Samosata had endeavoured to revive the heresy of Artemon. In the like manner, again, in ⁿ his Chronicle, as we now have it in Latin from St. Jerom; where it is also said, that Domnus, ordained in Paul's room, was the sixteenth bishop of the church of Antioch.

The fathers of the second council, by whom Paul was deposed, write in their Synodical Epistle, ‘ that ^o he had laid aside the hymns usually sung in honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, as modern, and the compositions of modern men—that ^p he refused to acknowledge, with them, that the Son of God came down from heaven—that ^q he had abjured the mystery of our religion for the accursed heresy of Artemas.’ And at the conclusion they say, ‘ Let ^r him write to Artemas, if he pleaseth; and let the followers of Artemas hold communion with him,’

St. Athanasius represents Paul's sentiments after this manner: 'That ' he believed Christ to be God from a virgin; God ' from Nazareth, seen there, and taking there the beginning of ' his existence, and of his kingdom. And he acknowledgeth ' in him the powerful Word from heaven, and Wisdom; by ' predetermination before all ages, in fact manifested at Naza- ' reth. So that, as he says, there is one God over all, even the ' Father. This is his impiety.' In other places he speaks of ' Paul's thinking ' Christ to be a man, and different from God

^l l. vii. cap. 27. ^m l. v. cap. 28. in.

ⁿ Paulus Samofatenus a cunctorum prædicatione desciscens Artemonis hæresim suscitavit. In cuius locum Antiochenæ ecclesiæ sextus decimus ordinatur episcopus Domnus. Euseb. Chr. p. 176.

^ο ψαλμὸς δὲ τῆς μεν αὖς τοῦ κυρίου κτλ.
 Ἰσχυρὸν χρίστος παύσαι, ὡς δὲ ὑπερῶς καὶ ὑπερ-
 ρων συγγραμματα. ad. Euf. H. E. l. 7. c.
 30. p. 281. A. P. Τοῦ μεν γὰρ υἱοῦ τοῦ

ἡ ἐπειδὴ καὶ πάντες αἰρῖτικοί τετο λόγοις ἠ-
 ὠθασιν, ὡς παῦλος ο σαμοσαίους θείει ἐκ τῆς
 παρῆς ὁμολογίης, θείει ἐκ ναζαρεί, ὀφθίνα, καὶ
 ἐβλῆνθι τῆς υπαρχίης τῆς ἀρχῆς ἰσχυρίστα,
 καὶ ἀρχῆς βασιλείας παρῆλθοντα· λόγοις ἡ
 ἐργον ἐξ ἡραν, καὶ σοφία ἐν αὐτῶ ὁμολο-
 γίᾳ τῶν προφῶσιμω πρὸ αἰώνων οἶα, τῆς
 υπαρχίης ἐκ ναζαρεί ἀπαδιχθίνα· ἡ καὶ ἐν,
 φῆσιν, ο ἐπὶ παῖν ὁμοίᾳ ο πατῆρ. Ath. contr.
 Apollin. l. 2. T. i. p. 942. A. Bened.

ἵνα μὴ οὐ σαμοσατεύς προσέλθῃς ἐν τῇ, ἀ-
 θρώσκων αὐτὸν λέγων, ὡς ἄλλοι οὐκ ἔστι παρὰ τοῦ
 θεοῦ λόγος. Ath. Ep. ad Max. T. i. p. 920. A.

‘the Word; and ^u that he was as to his nature a mere man, but after his birth as a man he became God by his advancement in virtue.’ In a piece ascribed to Athanasius, but ^w now generally supposed to be the work of a later writer, the followers of Paul are spoken of as believing, that ^{ww} God dwelled in Christ, or the man Jesus, in an especial manner.

St. Epiphanius says, that ^x Paul revived the heresy of Artemon: that ^y he taught God the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, to be one God: that ^a the Word and Spirit of God are always in God, as reason in the heart of man: and that the Son of God has no distinct subsistence, but subsists in God himself: that ^a the Word came and dwelled in the man Jesus: that ^b in the main he agreed with Sabellius, and Novatus, and Noetus, and others; though in part he differed from them: and that ^c upon the doctrine of the Deity his followers said no more than the Jews.

Philaster says, beside other things, ‘that ^d Paul taught that Christ was a just man, not the true God: thus Judaizing, and likewise teaching circumcision. He also converted Zenobia, a certain queen of that time in the East, to Judaism.’

But it is supposed that ^e Philaster is mistaken in saying that Paul taught circumcision; neither Eusebius, nor the fathers of the second council at Antioch, charging him with such a doctrine. It is not improbable, that this is a mere innocent mistake of Philaster; for as Arianism is ^f sometimes compared to heathenism, so it was likewise common with some Christians to call Unitarians Jews, or Judaizers. We (M) formerly saw how St. Basil writes, that Sabellianism is Judaism brought into the

^u οἱ ποιοῦντες οἱ ἀπὸ παύλης τῆς σαμοσα-
νίης, ὑπερὸν αὐτὸν μᾶλλον τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως ἐκ
περισσοῦ θεοποιεῖσθαι λέγουσιν, τῷ τῆς Φυ-
σὶς φίλον ἀνθρώπου γενέσθαι. De Syn. T. i.
p. 739. E. Conf. Socrat. H.E.l. 2. c. 19.
p. 98. D. ^w Vid. Admon. in Ep. de
Incarnat. Dei Verbi. T. ii. p. 33.

^{ww} ἡ γὰρ καὶ θεὸν ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ
λέγουσι, μὴ παραδιδωμέθα. De Incarnat.
ap. Ath. Op. T. ii. p. 35. A. ^x καὶ
αἰκνίσκει τὴν αἰρεσὶν τῆς ἀριμοσύνης. adv. Hær.
lxv. p. 608. A. ^y φασκεῖ δὲ ὅτι οὗτος,
θεὸς πατέρα, καὶ υἱόν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐνα-
θεὸς. ibid. ^a ἐν θεῷ δὲ αἱ οὐσίαι τῶν αὐτῶν

λόγοι, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῶν, ὡς περ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ
καρδίᾳ οἱ ἰδίοις λόγοι· μὴ εἶναι δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆ
θεοῦ ὑποστάσειν, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ θεῷ. ibid.

^a ἐθέλει δὲ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐνοικησαῖα ἐν
ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπῳ οὐκ. ib. B. ^b ib. A. B.

^c ἡ δὲ πλεονεξία τῶν ἡδαισίων, ὡς εἶπεν, δοξάζον-

τες. p. 609. B.

^d Hic Christum homi-
nem iustum, non Deum verum prædicabat,
judaizans potius; qui et circumcisionem
docebat. Unde et Zenobiam quandam
reginam in oriente tunc temporis ipse do-
cuit judaizare. Philast. Hær. 17. ^e Vid.
Basil. An. 264. n. v. Tillemont, et supra
Art. ii. p. 619. ^f ἐκείνοι δὲ κλισμα λε-
γούσιν τοὺς ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς υἱὸν τῆς θεοῦ καὶ λόγον,
ὅστις διαφέρει τῶν ἐθνικῶν. κ. λ. ap. Athanas.
de Vit. Anton. p. 848. Ed. Bened. Fit
igitur Ario, . . . ad familiaritatem Con-
stantii imperatoris promptus aditus et facilis
via. Suadetur Constantio, et quosdam in
Deo gradus credat: et qui per januam ab
errore idololatriæ fuerat egressus, rursus in
sinum ejus, dum in Deo deos querit, tam-
quam per pseudothyrum inducitur. P.
Orof. Histor. lib. ii. cap. 29. p. 542. ed.
Havercamp. (M) See p. 41.

church under the name of Christianity. In another place he says, we ^s abhor Sabellianism, as we do Judaism. So Epiphanius, who ^r had more learning than Philaster, said just now that, ‘ upon the doctrine of the Deity, the followers of Paul said no more ‘ than the Jews.’ And again he says, ‘ that ^r the Paulians, introducing Judaism, and teaching nothing more than them, are ‘ Jews, and ought to be so called:’ though, as he adds, ‘ to ‘ speak the truth, they do not practise circumcision, nor keep ‘ the sabbath, nor follow any other Jewish customs.’ And St. Chrysostom, at the same time that ^u he says the followers of Paul resembled the Jews, allows they differed from them in the point of circumcision.

We have farther to observe from St. Chrysostom, that he supposeth the followers of Paul to deny that ^w the only begotten pre-existed before all ages.

St. Augustine writes, ‘ The ^x Paulians, so called from Paul ‘ of Samosata, deny Christ’s eternity, and affirm that he then ‘ began to be when he was born of Mary: nor do they think ‘ him any thing more than a man. This heresy of Artemon, ‘ which was in a manner extinguished, was revived by Paul, ‘ and since by Photinus; so that now the Photinians are better ‘ known than the Paulians:’ or, they are now oftener called Photinians than Paulians.

What Marius Mercator writes of Paul’s sentiment at the beginning of the fifth century deserves notice; I therefore put his words in the †† margin for the sake of the learned, by whom

Ἔ ΟΤΙ ΕΠΙΣΗΣ ΤΩ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΣΜΩ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΤΟΙΑΥΤΗΣ
ΑΙΡΕΣΕΩΣ ΦΡΙΤΤΟΜΕΝ. Ep. 80. al. 189. p. 277.

D. ^r Cum Epiphanius longe Philastrio doctiorem invenerimus. August. Ep. 222. T. ii. p. 878. Bened. ^s ὅτοι δὲ τοὺς
ἰουδαίους παραφύσικους, ἢ δὲν περισσότερον
ταῖς ἰουδαίαις κεκήμενοι, δευτεροὶ ἰουδαῖοι κληθ-
σονται. κ. λ. Hær. 65. p. 608. D.

^t ἀληθὴ δὲ, οὐ γὰρ ἐπεὶ περιέλαυν ἔχουσιν, ὅτι
σαββατοῦ. κ. λ. ibid. ^u Ἀλλὰ πρὸς μὲν

ἰουδαίους ἀρκεῖ καὶ ταῦτα· ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἱ χωρὶς
περίληψιν τὰ ἐκείνων μνησμένοι καὶ ἑλκύντες οἱ
παῦλος τὴν σαμοσατείαν. κ. λ. Chryl. in. Pf. viii. p. 120. C. T. Tom. iii. ^w Ἐνταῦθα
καὶ τῆς ἀπὸ παύλου τῆ σαμοσατείαν ἐπιτομι-
σθῆν ἰκανῶς, οἱ τὴν προαιωνίαν ὑπαρξίν ἀναγρῶσι
τὴν μετογένεσιν. Εἰ γὰρ πρὸ τῆ τοκῆς τῆς μαρίας
ἦν πρὶν, ὅδε ὑπῆρχε πρὶν ἢ φανθῆναι ἐν σαρκί,
πῶς ἐνομοθετεῖ οὐ μὴ ὡς; Serm. 24. T. V. p. 347. B. C.

^x Pauliani, a Paulo Samofateno, Christum non semper fuisse dicunt; sed ejus initium, ex quo de Maria natus est, asseverant: nec cum aliquid amplius quam hominem putant. Ista hæresis aliquando

cujusdam Artemonis fuit, sed cum defecisset, instaurata est a Paulo; et postea sic a Photino confirmata, ut Photiniani quam Pauliani celebrius nuncupentur. Aug. de Hær. cap. 44. T. viii. p. 13. Bened.

†† Nestorius circa Verbum Dei, non quidem ut Paulus sentit, qui non substantivum, sed prolativum potentie Dei efficacius Verbum esse definit. Mar. Mercat. de discrim. Pauli et Nestorii. num. i. p. 17. Ed. Jo. Garner. Verbum autem Dei Patris, non substantivum, sed prolativum, vel imperativum sensit, atque pronuntiavit, [P. Samof.] non ut fides habet catholica, Verbum in substantia, vel essentia consubstantivum, id est, ὁμοουσιον Filium Dei Patris. Id. in Disf. de xii. Anathem. Nestorii. num. xvi. Differentia itaque inter Samofatenum et Photinum ista sola est, quia Paulus Verbum Dei προφορικῶς, καὶ πρακτικῶς λόγῳ καὶ ἐνεργητικῶς, id est, prolativum et potestatis effectivum Verbum sensit, non substantivum, quod Græci οὐσιωδὲς dicunt. Id. ib. num. xix.

they

they will be more easily understood than they can be translated by me. They seem, however, to amount to this: That by the Word, Paul understood the displayed, manifested, effective power of God, not a personal subsistence or real substance distinct from the Father.

I would likewise refer to * Damascenus, though his article contains nothing but the ** Synopsis of Epiphanius.

Theodoret's account of Paul and his sentiments was transcribed above: nothing needs to be added here.

All these are manifestly the accounts of enemies, as it was before hinted they would be, no other being now remaining. Though therefore they may be, for the main, just and right; yet possibly some things may be expressed harshly, if not improperly: nay, some of the accounts seem to differ; there must therefore be some mistake or misrepresentation; or else the seemingly opposite expressions must be understood with some qualification on one side or the other, or reconciled by a distinction. Paul is said to teach that Christ was a mere man, and nothing more than a man; and yet he is also allowed to have taught the indwelling of God in him, and that the Word came and dwelled in the man Jesus. He is said to have denied the pre-existence of the First-begotten, and of Christ; but yet he is said to have taught, that the Word was always in God. It is said he refused to acknowledge that the Son of God came down from heaven; and yet he acknowledgeth in him the powerful Word from heaven and Wisdom. These last expressions, seemingly contradictory, may be reconciled perhaps after this manner: Understand by the Word a distinct subsistence from God, he denied his coming down from heaven: but understand by the Word the ** Reason, the Wisdom, the Power of God, he taught that the Word from heaven came and dwelled in the man Jesus. This distinction may likewise be of some use elsewhere.

What became of Paul after his removal by Aurelian, in 272 or 273, is not known; but he had good opportunities for spreading his doctrine. His episcopate must have lasted twelve or thirteen years, nine years at least before he was deposed, and about three years afterwards, between the time of his deposition and final removal. The fathers in the second council ^v speak of his having flatterers among the bishops and presbyters of the

* Damasc. Hær. 65. p. 296. ** Epiph. T. i. p. 605. ^{xx} Hic est virtus Dei, hic ratio, hic sapientia ejus, et gloria. Hic in virginem illabitur, carnem, Spiritu Sancto cooperante, induitur. Cypr. de Idol. Van. p. 15. Et ipse a Patre exal-

tatus sit, quia se in terris sermo, et virtus, et sapientia Dei Patris humiliavit. Id. De Unit. Ecc. p. 118. ^v οὐκ αὐτὸν ἐπισκοπῆς τῶν ὁμοίων ἀγῶν τε καὶ πολλῶν καὶ πρεσβυτέρων. κ. λ. ap. Euf. L. 7. cap. 30. p. 281. B.

neighbouring

neighbouring cities and villages about Antioch, and ^a of his being beloved and admired by others: though indeed they ascribe that respect for him to the presents he had made those persons. Since, then, Paul was of an active temper, and a man of popular gifts, as it seems, and his episcopate was chiefly under the mild governments of Odenatus, and his wife and successor Zenobia, it may be concluded, he had in that time made a considerable number of profelytes. And, very probably, he at first found some Christians in his diocese of the same sentiments.

Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, affirms that ^a Lucian, who afterwards suffered martyrdom in 312, adhered to Paul, and separated from the church; or was held excommunicated from the church during the time of three bishops of Antioch. One might be almost apt to suspect, from Alexander's words, that he thought Lucian had succeeded Paul in the episcopal care and oversight of those who were in Paul's sentiments at Antioch.

The council at Nice, in one of their canons, ^b appoint, that the Paulianists should be rebaptized when they return to the catholic church. St. Augustine ^c has taken particular notice of that canon. And yet it appears from ^{cc} Athanasius, that the Paulians baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Paulians ^d are mentioned with others in an edict of Constantine against heretics. St. Chrysostom ^e often argues against the Paulians, and, I think, as then in being. Theodoret writes about 450, that ^f there were then no remains of them. And Pope Innocent the first, about 414, as ^g Tillemont observes, speaks of them as ^h if they subsisted no longer. However, St. Augustine, as we have seen, mentions them as if they were in being in his time, but the people of that sentiment were then oftener called Photinians than Paulians.

Neither Eusebius, nor the council of Antioch, nor Athanasius, that I remember, have any where charged Paul, directly or indirectly, with rejecting any books either of the Old or the New

^a ἀλλὰ καὶ πλεονεξίας ἀπεφθην¹ ἐφ' ᾧ πρὸς τῶν τοιαύτων ζήλων τινι φιλεῖται καὶ θαυμάζεται. *ibid.* D.

^a . . . παυλὴν τὴν σαμοσατῆν συνόδῳ καὶ κρίσει τῶν ἀπαύλαχον ἐπισκοπῶν ἀποκληρυχθῆναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας· οἱ δὲ ἀδεξάμενος ληκταῖος ἀποσυναγωγὸς ἐμείνει τριῶν ἐπισκοπῶν πολυετὲς χρόνος. *apud Theodoret.* H. E. L. i. cap. iv. p. 15. B.

^b Can. 19. ^c Istos sane Paulianos baptizandos esse in ecclesia catholica Nicæno concilio constitutum est. *Aug. de Hær. ib.*

^{cc} οὗτοι μαριχαιοί, καὶ φρυγες, καὶ οἱ τοῦ σαμο-

σατῆς μαθηταί, τὰ ὀνόματα λεγόντες, οὐκ ἦντο ἐν οἷσιν αἱρετικοί. *Ath. Orat. 2. contr. Arian. p. 510. E.* ^d Euseb. de vit. constant. L. iii. cap. 64. ^e Vid. Chrysost. in Pf. viii. T. 3. p. 120. B. C. et Tom. v. Serm. 20. p. 300. Serm. 24. p. 347. Ed. Front. Duc. ^f Vid. Theod. H. Fab. l. 2. cap. xi. de Photino. ^g See Paul de Samosates. *Art. vi.* ^h Quia Paulianistæ in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti minime baptizabant. *Innocent. i. Ep. 22. ap. Labb. Conc. T. ii. p. 1275. B.*

p 642.

Testament. Epiphanius expressly says, that ⁱ Paul endeavoured to support his doctrine by texts of scripture. Vincentius Lirinensis speaks of ^k this as a common method of heretics; and ^l says particularly of the works of Paul, and some others, that there was scarce a page without citations out of the Old or New Testament. Paul then, and the Paulians, used the same scriptures with other Christians.

This is a summary account of what the ancients write of Paul and his followers. It ought to be observed, that I have made no use of ^m the epistle to Paul ascribed to Dionysius, nor of the questions and answers joined with that epistle. If my account therefore of Paul's opinions appears defective, when compared with that given by ⁿ Tillemont, or some other moderns, I had rather it should do so, than run the hazard of deceiving my readers by borrowing from suspected or manifestly spurious pieces, whose testimony is not to be relied upon.

There can be no question but Paul was an author. It is very likely he would publish some vindications of himself and his opinions. Vincentius actually makes mention of his writings, as we observed just now. But, as I take the abovementioned questions to be spurious, I suppose none of his works to be now remaining.

As we have not now before us any of Paul's writings, and have his history from adversaries only, we cannot propose to judge distinctly of his talents, nor draw his character at length: however, from the several particulars before put down, and collected from divers authors, some things may be concluded; and I apprehend that, laying aside for the present the consideration of his heterodoxy, we shall not mistake much if we conceive of him after this manner: he had a great mind, with a mixture of haughtiness, and too much affection for human applause. He was generally well respected in his diocese, and by the neighbouring bishops; in esteem with the great, and beloved by the common people. He preached frequently, and was a good speaker. And from what is said by (x) the fathers of the coun-

ⁱ Epiph. ib. p. 608. B. ^k Hic fortasse aliquis interroget, an et hæretici divinæ scripturæ testimoniis utantur? Utuntur plane, et vehementer quidem. Nam videas eos volare per singula quæque sanctæ legis volumina. . . Vincent. comm. cap. 35. p. 356. Ed. Baluz. Paris. 1669. ^l Lege Pauli Samosatani opuscula, Priscilliani, Eunomii, Joviniani, reliquarum-

que pestium: cernas infinitam exemplorum congeriem, prope nullam omitti paginam, quæ non novi aut veteris testamenti sententiis fucata et colorata sit. Id. ibid. ^m ap. Labbei Concil. T. i. p. 849. . . . 893. ⁿ Vid. Paul de Samosates. Art. ii. Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. p. 615. &c. (x) See before, p. 88.

cil,

cil, of (o) his rejecting or laying aside some hymns, as modern, and composed by moderns; it may be argued, that he was a critic; which is a valuable accomplishment at all times, especially when uncommon*.*.

I have now given a sufficient history of the controversies of those times, and of the part Dionysius had in them.

IX. I need not enlarge in the account of Dionysius's works, several learned men having already composed catalogues of them, so far as we are informed of their titles by ancient authors; as Cave in his *Apostolici*, or *Lives of the Primitive Fathers*, vol. i. and in his *Historia Literaria*; and Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Græca*; both dividing his works into treatises and epistles, and the latter disposing his epistles in the alphabetical order of the names of the persons or people to whom they are directed. Tillemont^p likewise, as usual, is exact and particular upon this head. Basnage^q digests our author's works in the order of time, which also is^r Du Pin's method. And Pagi^s has judicious observations relating to the time of some of Dionysius's writings.

I have quoted several of his epistles, and mentioned some others, observing likewise sometimes the most probable date of them. It is necessary, however, that I add here a few things.

1. Particularly I would transcribe a passage of Eusebius, following what was formerly taken from him concerning Diony-

(o) Possibly those hymns were partly ancient, partly modern; having been altered and interpolated since their first original: and some of them might be entirely modern. Dionysius speaks of the many hymns [*της πολλης ψαλμωδίας*] composed by Nepos, with which many of the brethren were mightily pleased. Euseb. l. vii. c. 24. Dionysius does not expressly say that those hymns were sung in the public assemblies of Christians; but it is very probable they were. And so Cave supposeth; for thus he writes, *Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 86. de Nepote: Scripsit adhuc Nepos in ecclesiæ usum psalmos atque hymnos quam plurimos, pios admodum, et ab ipso Dionysio celebratos.* And in his *Apostolici*, p. 194, in the Life of Dionysius, he says of Nepos; 'That he was a man eminent for his skill in the holy scriptures, and for the many psalms and hymns he had composed, which the brethren sung in their public meetings.' Conf. Valef. An. ad Euseb. l. vii. c. 24. p. 153. C. Such hymns as these, composed by private persons, are the hymns which Paul rejected, or laid aside, that is, would not allow to be used in public worship.

And the 59th canon of the council of Laodicea forbids that any psalms or hymns composed by private persons should be sung in the church. So that what was reckoned in Paul to be a great fault, afterwards obtained general approbation.

. A learned writer among the moderns, whom I did not think of when I drew the above character, confirms almost every part of it; for he allows Paul to have possessed the third see in the church, and to have had the patronage of a great prince, an appearance of piety, reputation for learning, flowing eloquence, and the favour of the multitude. Ex infimæ fortis homine factus est Antiochenus episcopus, et tertium ecclesiæ thronum iisdem artibus conscendit, quibus hæretici solent, feminæ principis potentia, specie pietatis, doctrinæ fama, dicendi facilitate, et multitudinis factiosæ gratia. J. Garner. Diff. i. de Hær. et Li. Nestor. cap. iii. § iii. p. 307.

^o T. v. p. 263. . . . 267. ^p Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. ^q Ann. P. E. 247. n. vii. ^r Nouv. Bib. T. i. p. 187, &c.

^s Vid. Pagi Crit. 257. n. iv.

sius's writings against Sabellius. Says Eusebius; 'And beside these he wrote many other epistles, still extant, and some large treatises in an epistolary form; as the books concerning Nature, inscribed to his son Timothy, and the book of Temp- tations, inscribed to the forementioned Euphranor. Moreover, in a letter to Basilides, bishop of one of the churches of Penta- polis, he mentions ^w a Commentary he had written upon the beginning of the book of Ecclesiastes. And there are many other letters of Dionysius to the same Basilides.'

From this passage it appears, that many of Dionysius's letters were of a great length; indeed they were properly treatises in- scribed to friends, or others; and in some of them he displayed his copious learning without reserve, though without ostenta- tion. His two books concerning the Promises, mentioned above, the fragments of which are to be transcribed hereafter, were ^z letters, or written in an epistolary form.

2. In Eusebius's Evangelical Preparation ^y are large and no- ble fragments of the books concerning Nature, which shew the author's excellent capacity, and his great learning, and intimate acquaintance with the Greek poets and philosophers, as well as with the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. If there were nothing else remaining, this fragment alone would be suf- ficient to shew that Dionysius was a fine writer.

3. St. Jerom confirms what Eusebius writes of the Commen- tary upon Ecclesiastes; for, enumerating this bishop's works, he says, 'there ^z were many letters to Basilides, in one of which he tells him, he had begun to write a Commentary upon the Ec- clesiastes.' In another place Jerom mentions Dionysius, with several others, who, he says, had ^a largely explained the first epistle to the Corinthians.

4. We still have one letter to Basilides, now generally called a Canonical epistle. It is supposed to have been written ^b about the year 262. Fleury ^c says; 'Of all the writings of St. Dio- nysius of Alexandria, the only one that remains entire and un- questionable is the Canonical epistle to Basilides the bishop, who

¹ H. E. L. vii. c. 26. ^u Καὶ δὲ καὶ πολὺς τις λόγος ἐν ἐπιστολῇ χαρακτηριστῇ γρα- φῆς ὡς οἱ περὶ φυσικῆς Τιμοθίου τοῦ παιδὸς ἀποστολικοὶ. ib. B. 277. A. B.

^w ὅτι αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξηγήσιν πε- ποιησθαι τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ. ib. B. ^x Conf. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 26. in. et cap. 25. Vid. Vales. Annot. p. 154. B. ^y l. xiv. cap. 23. . . . 27. p. 772. . . . 784.

^a Ad Basilidem quoque multæ episto-

læ: in quarum una se asserit etiam in Ec- clesiasten cœpisse scribere commentarios. De V. i. cap. 69.

^a Origenes, Diony- sius, Pierius, Eusebius Cæsariensis, Didymus, Apollinaris, latissime hanc epistolam interpretati sunt. Ep. 31. [al. 52.] p. 243. fin. Bened. ^b Vid. Basn. a. 247. n. vii.

^c Fleury's Ecclesiastical Hist. B. vii. ch. 56. Vol. i. p. 470. in the English edition.

' had

‘ had consulted him upon several points of discipline.’ But perhaps we may add to this the epistle to Novatus, which, as recorded in ^d Eusebius, seems to be entire. I shall make use of that epistle to Basilides by and by, when I come to observe our author’s testimony to the scriptures.

In the mean time, as the conclusion of it is too signal a proof of prevailing humility to be omitted, it shall be here transcribed. ‘ You ‘ asked those questions, my dear son, not through ignorance, but only to do honour to us, and to cultivate our unanimity and friendship. And I, for my part, have declared my ‘ opinion, not as a teacher, but making use of that freedom with ‘ which it becomes us to speak to each other. Do you judge according to the understanding that is in you; and write me ‘ word what is best in your opinion.’ Dionysius writes thus, says ^f Fleury, out of humility: for indeed his authority was very great, on account of the dignity of his see, his age, and the glory of his having been twice a confessor, as well as on account of his virtues and learning.

5. Eusebius has preserved ^g large and valuable fragments of a letter of Dionysius to or against one Germanus, a bishop of those times; who had calumniated Dionysius, as if he had not taken due care of his people, or not shewn sufficient courage in time of persecution. This obliged Dionysius, in defence of himself, to relate his own sufferings at several times. This letter, according to Basnage’s ^h computation, was written in the year 259. I have made use of the fragments of it in the history I have given of Dionysius.

I would here put down a passage of Eusebius not yet transcribed. ‘ Beside ⁱ the forementioned letters, in that time [the persecution ‘ under Valerian, and Dionysius’s exile] he wrote those Paschal ‘ epistles, which we still have. . . Of these, one is written to Flavius, ‘ another to Domitius and Didymus, in ^k which also he published ‘ a canon [or cycle] of eight years; after having shewn that Easter ‘ ought not to be kept till after the vernal equinox.’ I have put down this passage, as affording an argument of Dionysius’s skill in mathematical learning, and astronomical computations.

They who are desirous of being informed of the nature of those Paschal epistles may consult ^l Valesius, ^m Du Pin, or ⁿ Tillemont.

^d Euf. l. vi. cap. 45.

Conc. T. i. p. 836. D. E.

i. p. 471.

l. vii. c. 1.

^h Dum exulem agit Dionysius A. 259, ab Emiliano pulsus, adversus Germanum scripsit epistolam, quæ gravia passus est complectentem. Basn.

^e ap. Labb.

^f ib. Vol.

^g Euf. H. E. l. vi. cap. 40.

^h Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 588, 589.

ⁱ Lib. vii. cap. 20.

^k καὶ ἐκδοταὶ οὐλαστῆριδος. ib. 266. A. B.

^l Annot. in Euf. p. 151.

^m Bib.

ⁿ Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 588, 589.

Saint Den. d’ Art. 13.

ibid. ⁱ Lib. vii. cap. 20. ^k καὶ ἐκδοταὶ οὐλαστῆριδος. ib. 266. A. B.

^l Annot. in Euf. p. 151. ^m Bib.

des Ant. Ecc. Tom. i. p. 188.

ⁿ Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 588, 589.

Saint Den. d’ Art. 13.

7. It has been disputed, whether Dionysius ever wrote against Origen. Cave^o declares himself with some positiveness on the affirmative side of that question. Nevertheless, ^p at this time, learned men are for the most part clearly of opinion, that he did not. We ^q have formerly observed Dionysius's discourse of martyrdom, inscribed to Origen, supposed to have been written in the time of the Decian persecution, when our author had been bishop several years. And Stephen Gobar, in Photius ^r says, 'That Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, wrote to Origen, and commended him after his death in a letter to Theotecnus, bishop of Cæsarea.' Dionysius therefore always retained a high respect for his master Origen.

8. There remains still one particular more to be considered in this place: whether Dionysius be author of ^s the Epistle to Paul of Samosata, containing likewise ten questions of Paul, with answers to them. That he wrote a letter relating to that affair a little before his death, is out of question. We saw the proofs of it formerly. The only dispute is, whether what we now have with the above-mentioned title be rightly ascribed to Dionysius. By ^t Cave it is called doubtful, or rather supposititious. By Valesius ^u it is rejected in a like manner. Du Pin ^w is of the same opinion, which he supports by the difference of style from Dionysius, and by other considerations: as does ^x Basnage likewise. Fagi ^y allows the Epistle not to have been written by Dionysius; but yet he thinks it might be written by some other bishop of that time: which supposition Basnage ^z endeavours to confute by arguments tending to shew it was written by some impostor a good while afterwards. Tillemont ^a doubts, whether the reasons of Valesius and Du Pin are of sufficient weight to induce us to reject that piece, as not written by Dionysius: and in a distinct note he treats of this point with a great deal of labour and learning, as well as modesty. Fabricius ^b is willing to allow the ge-

^o Scripsisse Dionysium adversus Origenem exinde liquet, quod fragmentum profert Anastasius Sinaita quæst. 233. p. 266.

^p τὸ κατὰ Ὀρίγην, quo de situ paradisi agit. De hoc opere silent Eusebius et Hieronymus. Cav. H. L. P. ii. p. 51.

^q Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. Ann. 246. n. iii. iv. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 267. in Tillemont, ib. p. 610. Du Pin, ibid. p. 190.

^r See p. 67, 68. ^s Cod. 232. p. 904.

^t Ap. Concil. Labb. T. i. p. 849, &c.

^u See Cave, as above-mentioned.

^v Ann. in Euseb. l. vii. cap. 30.

^w Bibl. p. 190. ^x Ann. 247. n. xi.

^y Crit. 264. n. iii. ^z Ut supra,

^a St. Denys d' Alex. Art. 17. p. 606. and note viii.

^b Nec tamen suppositam [Vide Tillemontium nota viii. ad Vitam Dionysii Alex. et Stillingfleeti Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity. p. 31.] illi videri, sed potius genuinam ejus esse Epistolam ad Paulum Samosatenum, et responsionem ad decem ejus propositiones; licet eam rejiciunt viri doctissimi Valesius ad Euseb. p. 155. seq. Elias Du Pin, Guil. Caveus, aliique etiam Harduinus ad Epistolam Chrysostomi ad Cæsarium. p. 9. qui Eutychiano alicui tribuit, Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 263.

nuineness of that work, moved, as it seems, by Tillemont's arguments, and those of bishop Stillingfleet, to whom he refers. It is certain, however, that this epistle is now, and has been for a good while, (Q) generally rejected by learned men as spurious: though (R) bishop Bull (good man!) was so happy as to know nothing of it; for which reason he securely quotes this piece as the genuine and undoubted work of St. Dionysius of Alexandria.

For my own part, I acquiesce in the reasons of the learned men beforementioned, so far as to think it highly probable that the piece in question is not the work of Dionysius, nor of any of his contemporaries, but of a much later date. For which cause I shall make no use of it in what follows in this chapter, as I have hitherto omitted to take any thing out of it. Indeed, if the probability of its spuriousness were somewhat less than it is, that might be a sufficient reason for an entire omission, or very slight notice of it in this work.

9. I need not stay to shew, that our Dionysius of Alexandria did not write any notes or commentaries upon the pretended Dionysius the Areopagite, (as some have thought) it having been already done by ^c others. And, as ^d Tillemont says, there are now scarce any persons, of ever so little learning, who believe the works ascribed to St. Dionysius the Areopagite were composed so early as the third century.

(Q) This appears from the names above-mentioned. See likewise note ^b what is there transcribed from Fabricius. I would add here some words of Dom. Bernard de Montfaucon: *Haud leve item illud est vestige indicium, quod e mentis ille Athanasius Epistolam Dionysii ad Paulum Samosatenum mittat ad Persas, quæ jam communi eruditorum calculo inter supposititia computatur. Vid. Monitum apud Athanas. Op. T. ii. p. 716. Ed. Bened.* From which passage I also conclude, that Montfaucon himself likewise rejects this piece, as clearly supposititious. (R) Tillem. in his note before referred to p. 886. observes, 'That bishop Bull often makes use of this as a certain and undoubted work of Dionysius; and says, that Dionysius there speaks almost divinely of the divinity of Jesus Christ. He likewise is very angry with Sandius, who rejects it.' This remark is too just; for bishop Bull does quote that piece as Dionysius's. Vid. *Defens. Fid. Nic.* § ii. cap. 11. § xi. p. 134. al. 148. And whereas San-

dus had alleged an argument from Brockmand, a German writer, to prove it spurious; Bull answers that he does not know, nor care, who Brockmand is. *ibid.* § 12. p. 135. And at last says, that all writers, ancient and modern, except perhaps that forementioned Brockmand, did unanimously ascribe it to Dionysius. . . . Epistolam contra Paulum Samosatenum; quam revera scripsisse Dionysium, auctores cuncti, tam veteres quam neoterici, (si unum fortasse Brockmandum illum excipias) unanimi consensu agnoscunt. *ibid.* p. 135. Inasmuch that, in the late edition of bishop Bull's works, Dr. J. E. Grabe thought himself obliged to add from Cave, by way of correction, the following note: *Multis suspecta est hæc Epistola, quod patres Antiocheni in Epistola Synodica apud Euseb. l. 7. cap. 30. diserte affirmant Dionysium quidem ad universam Antiochenam ecclesiam literas direxisse, Paulum vero nefalutatione dignatum. Vid. Cav. in Dion. Alex.*

^c Vid. *Fabric. Bib. Gr.* T. v. p. 5, et 263.
^d St. Den. d' A. art. 18. p. 610.

10. It has been observed, how few of Dionysius's works, either tracts or epistles, have come down to us entire. Du Pin^e says, the loss of his works is one of the most considerable of this kind which we could suffer. We have, however, divers fragments, which are very valuable, and some of considerable length.

X. It may be now expected, that I should attempt the character of Dionysius, of whom so much has been said. He has the title of Great given him by ^f Eusebius, ^g Basil, ^h Gregory of Nyssa, and ⁱ other ancient writers. I scarce need to say, that ^k Dionysius is in Jerom's Letter to Magnus, among other Christian writers; who, he says, were equally admirable for secular learning and the knowledge of the scriptures. In ^l another place he calls him the most eloquent bishop of Alexandria. When Theodoret nameth the principal bishops who were present at the first council against Paul, or invited to it, the character he gives Dionysius is, that ^m he was a man illustrious for his learning: and certainly this part of his character is justified by the remaining fragments of his works, though, in all probability, his learning would be much more conspicuous if his works were extant entire. The many epistles sent by him to so many different persons in several and remote parts of the world, upon the various points in question at that time, assure us of the general repute and esteem he was in. He was a person(s) of undissembled humility and modesty, and of great (τ) simplicity, to a degree uncommon in men of his extensive learning, and long and wide experience. He had (v) a great deal of natural good humour, cultivated by the principles of religion; by which means he excelled in that moderation and charity, which the Christian religion so earnestly recommends. His undisguised probity, or some vehemence of natural temper, rendered him liable to be sometimes off his guard, insomuch that in disputes he was apt to go into extremes: for, as St. Basilⁿ says, a man who intends

* Bibl. ib. p. 190.

^f ο μεγας ημιν

Αλεξανδριου επισκοπος Διονυσιος. Euf. l. viii.

in Proem. ^g τον μεγαν Διονυσιον. Bas.

p. 269. D. Ep. 188. [al. Canon. i.]

^h Gr. Nyss. de Vit. S. Gr. Thaum. p.

536. D. ⁱ Vid. Vales. in notis ad Euf.

l. vii. in Pr. et Pagi Crit. An. 265. n. iv.

^k Ep. 83. p. 656. ^l Vir eloquentif-

simus Dionysius Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ pon-

tifex. In. If. l. xviii. pr. p. 478. ^m απρ

πιστημος η διδασκαλος γενομενος. Theod.

Har. Fab. l. ii. c. 8. (s) See before,

p. 96, and other places, (τ) For

this I would refer to the history which Dionysius gives of Serapion in a letter to Fabius. Euf. l. vi. cap. 44. and to another history in a letter to Xystus, bishop of Rome, l. vii. cap. 9; and I suppose that this quality appears in some of the passages of Dionysius which I transcribe at length.

(v) Dionysius's good humour, moderation, and charity, are manifest in the fragments of the books concerning the promises, to be transcribed hereafter, as well as elsewhere. ^a Vid. Ep. 9. [al.

41.] p. 90. C. D.

to make a crooked plant straight, sometimes bends it too much the other way: so Dionysius, in opposition to Sabellianism, asserted not only a distinction of substences, but a difference of essence, and an inequality of power and glory. And perhaps some may think they see another like instance in the argument to be hereafter produced concerning the revelation; where Dionysius disputeth the genuineness of that book, when it might have been sufficient to confute the false interpretations which some had put upon it. We must not forget his generous zeal for truth, for the sake of which he practised much self denial, renouncing the honours and riches and grandeur of this world; thereby shewing true greatness of mind, and acquiring to himself glory and riches, preferable to all the advantages of a transitory life. He had a quick apprehension, and a lively fancy. His style is usually florid, and he wrote with spirit to the last; which, after the fatigues of above thirty years public service in the church, as catechist, or bishop, and after two confessions before heathen magistrates, and the sufferings that followed; beside the malicious calumnies, or false and unfair insinuations at least of some of his brethren, and the unkind and unfriendly charges and accusations of some other Christians; may be reckoned the proof of a firmness of mind, which is very glorious: for it could be founded on nothing so much as the consciousness of his integrity, and other supports and consolations of religion. To conclude, Dionysius fulfilled the duties of his station, and shined in his sphere. Unquestionably he was one of the ornaments of that age; and he^o may be esteemed the chief glory of the see of Alexandria for three centuries, from the time of the first founder of that church, who, as is generally supposed, was St. Mark, or, if not, very probably some other eminent Christian of the apostolic age; who, by the abundance of his spiritual gifts, which were common at that time, would have a distinction and pre-eminence above the greatest of his successors.

XI. Finally, we proceed to observe this writer's testimony to the books of the New Testament.

I begin with the Letter to Basilides, which we still have entire. In answer to a question sent him by that bishop, Dionysius observes; 'By^p what you write you shew that you well understand
' the divine evangelists, and that they have not precisely re-
' lated the hour when the Lord arose; for the evangelists have

* See Tillemont S. Den. d' Alex. art. 1. at the beginning.

^p Labb. Con. Tom. i. p. 332. Can. i.

expressed

expressed themselves differently concerning the time when those persons came to the sepulchre, and all of them say that they found the Lord already risen; *And in the end of the sabbath*, as Matthew says, chap. xxviii. 1. *And early when it was yet dark*, as John, chap. xx. 1. *And very early in the morning*, as Luke, chap. xxiv. 1. *And very early in the morning, at the rising of the sun*, as Mark, chap. xvi. 2. But when he arose, no one has expressly said. . . . And let us not think ⁹ that the evangelists disagree, or contradict each other, although there be some small difference. Let us therefore honestly and faithfully endeavour to reconcile them. Then Dionysius recites those several places of the four evangelists more at large, with some remarks, and in the same order.

This passage is extremely valuable. It shews there were four evangelists, or sacred authentic historians of the life and doctrine of Jesus Christ, received by Christian people, and no more, and who they were. The order likewise in which they are quoted is observable; first, the two apostles, Matthew and John; then the two companions or fellow labourers of apostles, Luke and Mark. Very probably this was the order of many codes, or volumes, of the four gospels.

In this Epistle ^r Dionysius refers to the woman cured of her infirmity by touching the hem of Christ's garments, recorded by more than one of the evangelists.

Here ^s also is quoted Rom xiv. 23; and, lastly, some ^t words of 1 Cor. vii. 5, expressly as Paul's.

XII. In the passages formerly transcribed from Dionysius we saw divers texts of the Acts of the apostles, and St. Paul's epistles, expressly quoted, or clearly referred to. I might here observe some other like quotations, or references, to several of St. Paul's epistles in other remaining fragments of Dionysius; but it is needless: and, besides, some more instances will appear in a long passage, which must be necessarily produced hereafter. I would therefore only observe here, that Dionysius received the Epistle to the Hebrews as the apostle Paul's. This appears evident, I think, from what he writes to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, relating the early sufferings of the Christians at Alexandria before the publication of Decius's edict. Says he, 'The'

⁹ Καὶ μὴ διὰ φωνῆς, μὴ διὰ ἡλικίας
τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν υπολαβόμεν' ἀλλ' ὡς καὶ μι-
κρολογία τις ἵνα δοξῇ περὶ τοῦ ζητημένου. . .
ἀλλ' ἡμῶν ἐκ γνησίου τα λεχθέντα καὶ πῶς
ἡμῶνται προσημειώμεν. ib. E. et p. 833. A.
^r ib. Can. ii. p. 836. ^s ib. Can. iv.

^t Can. iii.

^u Ἐξελθόντες δὲ καὶ ὑπα-
χώμεν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ τῇ ἀρπαγῇ τῶν ὑπαρ-
χόντων, ὁμοίως ἐκείνοις οἷς καὶ Παῦλος μαρ-
τυροῖται, μετὰ χάριτος προσεδέξαντο. ap. Euf.
H. E. l. vi. c. 41. p. 237. B. C.

‘brethren withdrew, saving themselves by flight; and took joy-fully the spoiling of their goods, like unto those whom Paul commends;’ Heb. x. 34.

Here it should be observed again, that I do not make use of the forementioned epistle to Paul of Samosata with the questions and answers. There ^w is quoted Heb. x. 28, 29, as the apostle’s, meaning Paul, and other texts of that epistle. But as we have very probable arguments to induce us to think that piece is a composition much later than the age of Dionysius, I take nothing out of it.

XIII. I do not recollect any thing in the genuine fragments of Dionysius, that shews his opinion about the controverted catholic epistles, except what we shall see presently in the passage concerning the book of the Revelation, where St. John’s three epistles are expressly mentioned. However, in another passage cited by Athanasius, Dionysius observes, that ^x the apostle has the expression of *doer of the law*; which expression is in Rom. ii. 13, and James iv. 11. And therefore both these texts are put in the margin by the Benedictine editor of St. Athanasius’s works. But it is well known, that by the apostle in ancient ecclesiastical writers, is to be understood Paul; therefore it cannot be well doubted, but Dionysius intends the text in the epistle to the Romans: and if he had designed to refer also to the text of James, he would have signified it some way or other.

XIV. In the time of Dionysius’s episcopate there were great numbers of Christians in the district of Arsinoe in Egypt, who were very fond of the millenary notion, expecting a kingdom of Christ here on earth, in which men should enjoy sensual pleasures. These persons were much confirmed in this opinion by a book of Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, entitled A Confutation of the Allegorists. Dionysius had a disputation or conference with those Christians, of which he gave an account in one of his books, written upon that subject. In a fragment, which we have in Eusebius, he writes to this purpose: ‘When,’ says he, ‘I was in the province of Arsinoe, where you know this opinion has for some time so far prevailed as to cause divisions and apostasies of whole churches; having called together the presbyters and teachers of the brethren in the villages, admitting likewise as many of the brethren as pleased to be present; I

^w Conc. T. i. p. 868. A.
 ποιντης, ο αποστολος ειπε ρομ. ap. Athan.
 De Sent. Dionys. T. i. p. 257. E.
^y ειδα, ως οιδες, ης ο πολλων τωτο επιπο-
 λαζε το δογμα, ως και σχισματα και αποστα-

^x Και σιας ο αν εκκλησιων γιγονται συγκαλη-
 της πρεσβυτερης και διδασκαλης των εν ταις
 κωμαις σιδαφον. κ. λ. ap. Euf. l. vii. c.
 24. p. 272. A.

‘advised that this opinion should be publicly examined into.
‘And when they produced to me that book as a shield and im-
‘pregnable bulwark, I sat with them three whole days suc-
‘cessively, from morning till evening, discussing the contents of
‘it.’ He goes on, highly applauding the good order of the dis-
‘pute, the moderation and candour of all present, their willing-
‘ness to be convinced, and to retract their former opinions, if rea-
‘son so required: ‘With a good conscience,’ says he, ‘and un-
‘feignedly, and with hearts open to the sight of God; em-
‘bracing² whatever could be made out by good arguments from
‘the holy scriptures. In the end, Coracio, the chief defender
‘of that opinion, engaged and promised, in the presence of all
‘the brethren, that he would no longer maintain, nor defend,
‘nor teach, nor make mention of it, as being fully convinced
‘by the arguments on the contrary side. And all the brethren
‘who were present rejoiced for the conference, and their mutual
‘reconciliation and agreement.’

This was the dispute. Of the books written by Dionysius upon this subject, Eusebius speaks after this manner, and gives us farther the following passages, which we are now to transcribe, and make the best use of we are able. ‘Beside³ all these [be-
‘fore mentioned by Eusebius] there are two books of his Con-
‘cerning the Promises. The occasion of them was Nepos, a
‘bishop in Egypt; who taught, that the promises made to the
‘saints in the divine scriptures were to be fulfilled in a Jewish
‘sense; affirming, that there would be a certain thousand years
‘of bodily pleasures upon this earth. He^b thinking that he
‘could support this opinion by John’s Revelation, wrote a book
‘upon this argument, with the title of A Confutation of the
‘Allegorists. This book Dionysius answers in his books Con-
‘cerning the Promises. In the first book he lays down his own
‘opinion. In the second he discourseth of John’s Revelation.
‘And at the beginning of this book he speaks of Nepos to this
‘purpose: “But because they produce a book of Nepos, on
“which they mightily rely, as if he had beyond all contradic-
“tion demonstrated, that there shall be a kingdom of Christ
“upon this earth: on many other accounts truly I respect and
“love Nepos; for his faith, and industry, and study^c of the

² . . . τα ταις αποδειξιν και διδασκαλιας
των αγιων γραφων συνταξις καταδεχο-
μενοι. ib. p. 272. B. C. ³ l. vii. c.
24. in. ^b Δοξας ην εως εκ της αποκα-
λυψης Ιωαννη την ιδιαν κρατυναι υποληψι-
μην αλληγορησαν λογον τινα περι ταυτη

συνταξας επιγραφει προς ον ο Διονυσιος εν
τοις περι επαγγελιων εισαγεται. ib. p. 271. A.
^c Και της εν ταις γραφαις διατριβης, και
της πολλης ψαλμωδίας, η μεχρι νυν πολλοι
των αδελφων εβουλησινται. ib. p. 271. B.

“ scriptures, as well as for the many hymns composed by him,
 “ with which not a few of the brethren are still much delighted.
 “ And I reverence him the more, because he is dead. But
 “ truth is to be preferred and esteemed above all things; and
 “ as we ought without envy to approve, and readily commend
 “ what is well said, so have we also a right to examine and cen-
 “ sure whatever appears otherwise. Since, then, the book is
 “ public, and by some thought to be plausibly written, and^d
 “ there are some teachers who look upon the law and the pro-
 “ phets to be of no value, and neglect to follow the gospels, and
 “ despise the epistles of the apostles; whilst at the same time
 “ they extol the doctrine of this book, as containing some great
 “ and hidden mystery, and suffer not the weaker of our brethren
 “ to conceive any thing great and magnificent, either of the
 “ glorious and truly divine *appearance of our Saviour*, (Tit. ii. 13.)
 “ or of our resurrection from the dead, and *our gathering to-
 “ gether*, (2 Thess. ii. 1.) and *likeness to him*, (1 John iii. 2.) but only
 “ to expect in the kingdom of God poor and mortal things,
 “ and such as we now enjoy in the present state; it is necessary
 “ that we enter into dispute with our brother Nepos, as if he
 “ was present.”

‘ Afterwards,’ says^e Eusebius, ‘ of the Revelation of John he
 ‘ writes thus: “ Some^f who were before us have utterly re-
 “ jected and confuted this book, criticising every chapter, [or
 “ paragraph] shewing it to be throughout unintelligible and
 “ inconsistent; adding, moreover, that the inscription is false,
 “ forasmuch as it is not John’s: nor is it a revelation which is
 “ hidden under so obscure and thick a veil of ignorance; and^g
 “ that not only no apostle, but not so much as any holy or ec-
 “ clesiastical man, was the author of this writing; but^h that
 “ Cerinthus, founder of the heresy called after him Cerinthian,
 “ the better to recommend his own forgery, prefixed to it an
 “ honourable name. Forⁱ this (they say) was one of his par-
 “ ticular notions, that the kingdom of Christ should be earthly;
 “ consisting of those things which he himself, a carnal and sen-
 “ sual man, most admired, the pleasures of the belly, and of con-

^d . . . και τινες διδασκαλων του μεν νομου
 και της προφητας το μηδεν ηγμενω, και τοις
 ευαγγελιους επισβαι παρεντων και τα των
 αποστολων επισβολαι εκφαιδισαντων. ib. C.

^e ib. c. 25. iii. ^f Τινες μιν εν προ-
 κλημιν ηθετησαν και ανεσκευασαν παντη το βί-
 βλιον, καθ’ εκαστον κεφαλαιον διευθυνοντες. ib.
 p. 272. D, 273. A. & και εχ’ οπως των

αποστολων τινα, αλλ’ οδ’ ολως των αγιων.
 των απο της εκκλησιας τετη γιγονται ποιη-
 την τε γραμματος. Κερινθος δε . . . αζι-
 πιστον επιφημισαι βλησαντα τε εαυτη πλασ-
 ματι ονομα. ib. 273. A. ^h Conf. Eus.
 l. iii. c. 28. p. 100. B. ⁱ Τωτο γαρ
 ειπαι της διδασκαλιας αυτη το δογμα, επι-
 γινον εισθαι την τε Χριστη βασιλεια. 273. A.

“ cupiscence;

by him,
ighted.
l. But
gs; and
mment
nd cen-
book is
and
he pro-
els, and
e time
e great
rethren
of the
ii. 13.)
ring to-
ut only
things,
cessary
as if he

ohn he
rly re-
er, [or
le and
s false,
hich is
and
or ec-
h that
thian,
o it an
s par-
rthly;
d sen-
f con-

αγιω
αι ποιη-
αζιο-
πιδας-
af. Euf
στο γαρ
α, επι-
273. A.

ence;

“cupiscence; that is, eating, and drinking, and marriage; and,
“for the more decent procurement of these, feastings, and sa-
“crifices, and slaughters of victims. But, ^k for my part, I dare
“not reject the book, since many of the brethren have it in high
“esteem: but, allowing it to be above my understanding, I sup-
“pose it to contain throughout some latent and wonderful mean-
“ing; for though I do not understand it, I suspect there must
“be some profound sense in the words; not measuring and
“judging these things by my own reason, but ascribing more to
“faith, I esteem them too sublime to be comprehended by me.
“Nor do I condemn what I have not been able to understand:
“but I admire the more, because they are above my reach.”
Then, examining the whole book of the Revelation, and shew-
ing it impossible it should be understood in the obvious mean-
ing of the words, he goes on: “And having finished in a
“manner his prophecy, the prophet pronounceth those blessed
“that keep it, and also himself. For *blessed is every one*, says he,
“*that keepeth the words of the prophecy of this book; and I John,*
“*who saw and heard these things*: Rev. xxii. 7, 8. I do not deny,
“then, that his name is John, and that this is John’s book; for
“I acknowledge it to be the work of some holy and divinely in-
“spired person.¹ Nevertheless I cannot easily grant him to be
“the apostle, the son of Zebedee, brother of James, whose is the
“gospel inscribed according to John and the Catholic Epistle;
“for I conclude, from the manner of each, and the turn of ex-
“pression, and from the conduct [or disposition] of the book, as
“we call it, that he is not the same person: for ^m the evangelist
“no where puts down his name, nor does he speak of himself
“neither in the gospel nor in the epistle.” Then a little af-
ter he says again: “John no where speaks as concerning him-
“self, nor as concerning another. But he who wrote the Re-
“velation, immediately at the very beginning, prefixeth his
“name; *The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him*
“*to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass. And*
“*he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John, who bare*
“*record of the word of God, and his testimony, the things which he*
“*saw*. Rev. i. 1, 2. And then he writes an epistle: *John unto*
“*the seven churches in Asia. Grace be unto you and peace*, v. 4.

^k Εγω δε αθελσαι μεν ηκ αν τολμησαιμι
το βιβλιον, πολλων αυτο δια σωχης εχοντων
αδελφων. B. ¹ αγιω μεν γαρ ειναι τιος
και θεωρεσται συνανω' η μη ραδις αν συν-
βιμαρ τετον ειαι τον αποστολον, τον υιον ζε-
βεδαι, τον αδελφον Ιακωβη' η το ευαγγελιον

το κατα Ιωαννην επιγεγραμμενον, και η επισ-
τολη η καθολικη. p. 273. D. ^m ο μεν γαρ
ευαγγελιστης εδωκεν το ονομα παρεγγραφει
ηδε κηρυσσει εαυτον, ητε δια το ευαγγελιον,
ηδε δια της επιστολης. p. 274. A.

“ But

" But ⁿ the evangelist has not prefixed his name, no not to his
 " catholic epistle ; but, without any circumlocution, begins with
 " the mystery itself of the divine revelation : *That which was from*
 " *the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our*
 " *eyes,* 1 John, i. 1. And for the like revelation the Lord pro-
 " nounced Peter blessed ; saying, *Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona,*
 " *for flesh and blood has not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which*
 " *is in heaven,* Matt. xvi. 17. Nor ^o yet in the second or third
 " epistle ascribed to John, though indeed they are but short
 " epistles, is the name of John prefixed ; for without any name
 " he is called the Elder. But this other person thought it not
 " sufficient to name himself once and then proceed, but he
 " repeats it again ; *I John, who am your brother and companion in*
 " *tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in*
 " *the isle that was called Patmos for the testimony of Jesus,* Rev. i. 9.
 " And at the end he says ; *Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of*
 " *the prophecy of this book ; and I, John, who saw and heard these*
 " *things,* chap. xxii. 7, 8. Therefore that it was John who wrote
 " these things ought to be believed, because he says so. But
 " who he was is uncertain ; for he has not said, as in the gos-
 " pel often, that he is *the disciple whom the Lord loved* ; nor that
 " he is *he who leaned on his breast* ; nor the brother of James ;
 " nor that he is one of them who saw and heard the Lord :
 " whereas he would have mentioned some of these things if he
 " had intended plainly to discover himself. Of these things he
 " says not a word : but he calls himself *our brother and compa-*
 " *nion, and witness of Jesus,* and *blessed,* because he saw and heard
 " those revelations. And I suppose there were many of the
 " same name with John the apostle, who for the love they bore
 " to him, and because they admired and emulated him, and were
 " ambitious of being beloved of the Lord like him, were desirous
 " of having the same name : even as many also of the children of
 " the faithful are called by the name of Paul and Peter. More-
 " over, ^p there is another John in the Acts of the apostles, sur-
 " named Mark, whom Paul and Barnabas took for their com-
 " panion : concerning whom it is again said ; *And they had John*
 " *for their minister,* Acts xiii. 5. But that he is the person who
 " wrote this book, I do not affirm. Nor is it written that he
 " came with them into Asia. But it is said ; *Now when Paul*

ⁿ ο δε γε ευαγγελιστης αδε της καθολικης
 επιτολης προεγραψεν αυτου το ονομα. Β.

^o ΑΛΛ' αδε εν τη δευτερα φερομενη Ιωαννη
 και τριτη, και τοις βραχυταταις υσαις επιτολαις,

ο Ιωαννης ονομασται προκειται' αλλα αποσυμμε-
 ο πριςευτερος γεγραπται. C. P Εστι μιν
 εν και ιτερος Ιωαννης εν ταις πραξεσι των
 αποστολων, ο επικληθεις Μαρκος. p. 275. A.

p. 676.

“and his company loosed from Paphos, they came to Perga in Pamphylia: and John, departing from them, returned unto Jerusalem: v. 13. I think, therefore, that he is another, one of them that dwelled in Asia; forasmuch as it is said, that there are two tombs at Ephesus, each of them called John’s tomb. And from the sentiments, and words, and disposition of them, it is likely that he is different from him [who wrote the gospel and epistle.] For the gospel and epistle have a mutual agreement, and begin alike. That says; *In the beginning was the Word. This, That which was from the beginning.* That says; *And the word was made flesh, and dwelled among us. And we beheld his glory, the glory, as of the only begotten of the Father.* This has the same with little variation; *That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life. For the life was manifested.* These things he says by way of preface, pointing, as he afterwards shews, at those who asserted that the Lord was not come in the flesh. Therefore he also presently subjoins; *That which we have seen we testify, and declare unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us. That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.* He is uniform throughout, and wanders not in the least from the points he proposed to himself; but prosecutes them in the same sentences [literally, chapters] and words, some of which we shall briefly observe: for whoever reads with attention will often find in both, *life; frequently, light; avoiding of darkness; oftentimes, truth, grace, joy, the flesh and the blood of the Lord; judgment, forgiveness of sins, the love of God towards us, the commandment of love one toward another; the judgment of this world, of the devil, of antichrist; the promise of the Holy Spirit; the adoption of the sons of God; the faith required of us in all things; the Father and the Son, every where.* And, in a word, throughout the gospel and epistle it is easy to observe one and the same character. But the Revelation is quite different and foreign from these, without any affinity or resemblance, not having so much as a syllable in common with them. Nor does the epistle (for I do not here insist on the gospel) mention, or give any hint of the Revelation, nor the Revelation of the epistle. And yet Paul in his epistles has made some mention of his revelations, though he never wrote them in a distinct book. Moreover, it is easy to observe the difference of the style of the gospel and the epistle from that of the Revelation; for they are not only

ἢ Ἀλλοθεν τινα εἰσὶν τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ γινώσκων. 275. B.

“ written

“written correctly according to the propriety of the Greek tongue, but with elegance of phrase and argument, and the whole contexture of the discourse. So far are they from all barbarism and solecism, and even idiotism of language, that nothing of that kind is to be found in them: for he, as it seems, had each of those³ gifts; [or (x) words, 1 Cor. xii. 8, 10.] the Lord having bestowed upon him both these, knowledge and eloquence. As to the other, I do not deny that he saw the Revelation, or that he had [the gift of] knowledge and prophecy. But I do not perceive in him an accurate skill in the Greek tongue; on the contrary, I observe in him barbarisms, and some solecisms, which it is not necessary I should now shew particularly, for I do not write by way of ridicule; let no one think so. I only intended to represent, after a critical manner, the difference of these pieces.”

XV. I have now transcribed the whole of this argument, so far as it is preserved by Eusebius: it may afford occasion for many remarks; and I would hope for my reader's patient attention, whilst I mention these following observations.

1. We have here a proof of the great respect shewn to the scriptures by all Christians in general. Dionysius, describing the good temper of those who entered into conference upon the millenary doctrine, says, they were disposed to embrace whatever could be made out by good arguments from the holy scriptures. It was the temper of all parties; and Dionysius himself approved of it, for he mentions it by way of commendation. Moreover, this is one thing he says in praise of Nepos, and for which he highly esteemed him, that he was much addicted to the study of the scriptures.

2. We cannot but observe the general division of those scriptures, which were so greatly respected: The law and the prophets, for the Old Testament; gospels and epistles of the apostles, for the New. This is very remarkable, and entirely agreeable to several (y) passages already alleged. It shews that no epistle, or treatise, or doctrinal work, was esteemed by Christians, as of authority, but what was supposed to be written by apostles. When Dionysius censures some teachers, who had too great a regard for the doctrine contained in the book of bishop

³ Παῦλι διὰ τὸν ἐνδόξου ὑποφθιγνῶτος τὴν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων αὐτῆς, ὡς καὶ ἐμ-
 γράψῃ καθ' αὐτάς. p. 276. B. ⁴ ἐκαστῆ-
 ρος γὰρ εἶχεν ὡς εἶπεν τὸν λόγον. C.
 (x) Compare 1 Cor. xii. 8. To one is

given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to
 another the word of knowledge. v. 10. . . .
 to another prophecy. (y) See Vol. iii.
 p. and see hereafter in
 St. Cyprian, ch. 44. numb. 10.

Nepos, he blames them for undervaluing the law and the prophets, for neglecting the gospels, and despising the epistles of the apostles. If there had been any other sacred books among Christians, which had been of authority, as a rule by which opinions were to be judged, tried and determined, he would have mentioned them also by their general title and character. This shews, that writings of prophets, or other inspired persons of low rank, in the time of the gospel dispensation, were not canonical, or of authority; excepting only the historical writings of Mark and Luke, which undoubtedly were universally received, as has been shewn abundantly; and we have in particular seen that they were received by our great author.

3. In the passages just cited we have seen a very valuable testimony to divers parts, or books, of the New Testament; as, the gospels of Matthew and John, particularly the beginning of this gospel; the Acts of the apostles also distinctly cited by Dionysius, and express mention of St. Paul's epistles. He likewise assures us, that the first catholic epistle ascribed to John was written by the apostle and evangelist. He so describes the second and third epistles ascribed to John, as to satisfy us he meaneth the same we still have. And he speaks of these three epistles in such a manner as to confirm the testimonies of other writers about this time; that they were all well known; the first universally acknowledged as the apostle John's; and the other two also ascribed to him, but not altogether received without dispute. Lastly, with regard to the book of the Revelation, Dionysius bears witness, not only that Nepos founded his doctrine upon it, but likewise that it was in high esteem with many other of the brethren.

4. We have seen Dionysius's observations upon the book of Revelation, which I think must be allowed to be a good critique for those times. Dionysius was a learned man; and perhaps he had some considerable assistance from more ancient writings of the same kind. He actually speaks of some before him, who had criticised every period of this book. Whether he means Caius only, or some others likewise; I believe my readers may join with me in wishing, that we had them all before us, together with Nepos's book against the Allegorists, and Dionysius's answer in his books of the Promises, entire. However, we should be thankful for what we have, and duly improve it.

5. It may be questioned, whether this critique of Dionysius, about the middle of the third century, or any other critique whatever, can be sufficient to induce us to doubt of the genuineness

guineness of the Revelation, which by many ancient authors is expressly ascribed to John the apostle and evangelist. Besides, Dionysius's critique may be criticised, and perhaps the force of several of his observations may be abated. There are divers learned men, who have professedly examined Dionysius's argument, to whom ^c the reader is referred: though I intend to borrow some of their remarks, as well as add some of my own.

6. Here I desire to begin with considering what Dionysius alleges from others, which consists of several particulars.

For, 1. he says, that some before him had utterly rejected this book, criticising every period, or section, and shewing it to be throughout unintelligible. Here I cannot but say it appears to be a defect in Dionysius, that he has not named some of these critics, nor informed us of their character nor time: unless we could suppose that he had done this in some other part of his work not transcribed by Eusebius; or that there were some reasons to think he might suppress their names out of tenderness, it being not very popular to write against the book of the Revelation; or those authors having expressed themselves in an offensive manner, and taken too great liberties in opposing that book. Mill ^u thinks, that Caius only is intended, though Dionysius speaks in the plural number; and he flourished not above forty years before our author: and indeed part of what Dionysius allegeth afterwards from the writings before him suits what ^c Eusebius has in another place transcribed from Caius; but as Dionysius speaks in the plural number, I think it reasonable to understand him of more than one; for though we know not at this time of any one catholic writer by name, before Dionysius, who had disputed the genuineness of the Revelation, except Caius, it is not unlikely there might be more. It is not very easy to be supposed that Caius should be altogether singular: if he was the first, so plausible a writer would not be without followers. That there had been some controversies about the book of the Revelation before the time of Dionysius, may be argued from a work of Hippolytus, formerly (A) taken notice of, supposed to be written in defence of St. John's Gospel and the Apocalypse; or possibly to shew, that both these books came from that apostle, and that the Revelation was written by no other than him who

^c See Mill. Proleg. n. clxii. . . . clxxx. The bishop of London's third Pastoral Letter, p. 58. . . . 60. Mr. Leonard Twells's Critical Examination of the late New Text and Version of the New Testament, Part iii. p. 105. . . . 121. Beausobre et Lenfant, leur Preface sur L' Apocalypse. p. 606. . . . 608. Du Pin. Diss.

Prelim. sur la Bible Liv. ii. ch. ii. § 13. p. 68, 69. Fr. Ad. Lampe Prolegom. in Joann. l. i. cap. 7. n. xxvi. . . . xxviii. p. 126. . . . 130. ^u Caium intelligit, &c. Mill. Proleg. n. clxiii. vid. ibid. clxi.

(z) See before, ch. 32.

(A) See: Vol. iii. ch. 35.

wrote the Gospel. It seems to me to be to very little purpose to say, that no catholic authors had written against the genuineness of the Revelation before Dionysius, except Caius only, because neither Eusebius nor Jerom has mentioned them; for Jerom had his chief dependence on Eusebius: and if they were not mentioned by him, we have no great reason to expect them in Jerom. It ought farther to be observed, that scarce any beside Eusebius have taken particular notice of that passage of Caius, against the book of the Revelation; and that Eusebius, who here transcribes this passage of Dionysius, does not contradict him. Once more, it ought to be observed that Dionysius did not, so far as we know, mention Caius by name. As he omitted a particular mention of him a catholic writer, though probably he had some assistances from him, there may have been other writers of the church to whom he refers, though he has not named them.

2. They objected against the title, that it is improperly called a Revelation, which is so obscure; but I take this to be a trifling objection. The author, if he pleased, might call that a revelation, which had been communicated to him in an extraordinary manner, though he had received it, and was to represent it, in a figurative and emblematical style. Besides, it is often spoken of as a prophecy; see ch. i. 13. xxii. 7. 10. 18. 19. And it is no strange thing, that prophecies should be obscure when delivered, and for some time after. See 1 Pet. i. 10. 11. 12. and Luke xxiv. 25. 26. 27. 32. 44. 45. 46.

3. They said that the inscription is false, for the book was not written by John, ^e nor by any apostle, nor by any holy and ecclesiastical man, but by Cerinthus. But all or most of these assertions are without ground and reason. The author was certainly a holy man, and the book is a truly pious and religious book. I suppose I may appeal to every man of taste, if the book is not written in a high strain of piety; and therefore it follows, that the writer's name is John, as he calls himself; for so good a man could not be a downright liar and impostor. Consequently, likewise, Cerinthus could not be the author, unless he also was called John.

But there are other things, chiefly two, which are usually said by learned men in answer to that assertion, that Cerinthus was the author of the Revelation: first, that ^w the Revelation contradicts many of Cerinthus's opinions, and therefore could not be the work of Cerinthus. Irenæus ^x informs us that, among other

^y Vid. Mill. Proleg. n. clxvii. Mr. Twells, as before, p. 109.

^x Iren. lib. i. cap. 26. al. 25.

things, Cerinthus denied that God made the world : whereas the writer of the Revelation often teaches the contrary ; see Rev. iv. 11. x. 6. Another point of Cerinthus was, that Christ did not suffer, but Jesus only. But the author of the Revelation calls Jesus, Christ, not Jesus alone, the first begotten of the dead ; and adds, that the same Jesus Christ washed us from our sins in his own blood ; Rev. i. 5. Again, v. 7. he says of the entire Jesus Christ, that he was pierced. It is therefore improbable to the highest degree, that Cerinthus should write the Revelation under the name of John ; for had he meditated such a fraud in favour of his millennium, he would have so contrived it as not to hurt his other equally favourite opinions. Secondly, it is said, that the Revelation does not establish Cerinthus's notions of the millennium, as it is described by the objectors, but directly contradicts and overthrows them ; for ^y the author of the Apocalypse expressly tells us, that fleshly impurity shall keep men from entering into the new Jerusalem ; or, ^z in other words, St. John describes his Jerusalem as inhabited by none but pure and holy persons ; Rev. xxi. 27. xxii. 14. 15. whilst Cerinthus's Jerusalem was to be the residence of the earthly and the sensual. His citizens were to serve their passions and their pleasures : whilst the men of John's Jerusalem were to serve God, and the Lamb, Rev. xxii. 3 ; or, as it is happily expressed by a great ^a author, ' His millenary state was not the life of saints, as the Apocalypse represents it, but the life of libertines.'

As for the first of these reasons, it appears to me not only just and solid, but alone sufficient to overthrow the objection, and to shew that Cerinthus did not compose the Revelation. But with regard to the second answer, with all due submission I would say, that I am not fully satisfied that it is just ; for, allowing the character here given of Cerinthus by enemies to be in the main right and true, that he was a carnal man, and too fond of sensual enjoyments ; still there is nothing impure or vicious in their description of his millenary state. They do not say he taught that the kingdom of Christ should consist in riot and excess, and intemperance, adulteries, and all manner of uncleanness ; but in eating and drinking, and nuptial entertainments, and other festivities ; none of which are unlawful. It is true, this was low and mean : but such was the notion of all the Chiliafists at that time, so far as appears. Eusebius says, Nepos taught, that the promises made to the saints in the divine scriptures were to be fulfilled in a Jewish sense ; affirming that there would be a cer-

^y Mr. Twells, as before, p. 110.

^z Mr. Twells, p. 101.

^a My Lord of London in his Third Pastoral Letter, p. 58.

tain thousand years of bodily pleasures upon this earth: and he supposed he could defend that notion by the book of Revelation. Dionysius likewise assures us, that they who admired Nepos's book suffered not the weaker of the brethren to conceive any thing great and magnificent, either of Christ's future glorious appearance, or of our gathering together and likeness to him; but only to expect in the kingdom of God poor and mortal things, and such as we now enjoy in the present state.

Here is a fair occasion for me to consider, what was the notion of the Chiliaists, or Millenarians of that time, who in other respects were orthodox: and likewise, whether Cerinthus was a Chiliaist, of which, though it is generally taken for granted, I have some doubt, because Irenæus^b says nothing of it. But though I defer a particular discussion of those points, there are some things to be taken notice of here, and which I have reserved for this place; otherwise I should have observed them before, either in the history of the affair of Nepos, or in the account of Dionysius's works.

For Theodoret expressly^c says, that, beside Caius and others, our Dionysius likewise wrote against the heretic Cerinthus. But it is^d very probable, that Theodoret means only these two books of the Promises, or some part of them.

On the other hand, Jerom says, that Dionysius wrote against Irenæus, who is among the most orthodox writers of the church; intending nevertheless, as is^e supposed, the same books that Theodoret does, those written against Nepos: for the two books against Nepos being against the Millenarians in general, as^f Tillemont says, they were by consequence against Irenæus, who was one of the most celebrated defenders of that opinion. And it is likewise easy to suppose, that he was here confuted by name.

Jerom's words in his Commentary upon the Prophecies of Isaiah are so remarkable, and so much to our present purpose, that I shall venture to transcribe them. 'If^g we understand the

^b Vid. Iren. Con. Hæc. l. i. cap. 26. [al. 25.] et lib. iii. cap. 11. init.

^c Har. Fab. l. 2. cap. 2. ^d Vid. Tillem. S. Den. d' Alex. art. 10.

^e Vid. Pagi Crit. 263. n. 2. ^f Tillemont, as before.

^g . . . et qua ratione intelligenda sit Apocalypsis Johannis, quam si juxta literam accipimus, judicandum est; si spiritualiter, ut scripta est, differimus, multorum veterum videbimur opinionibus contraire, Latinorum, Tertulliani, Victorini, Lactantii; Græco-

rum, ut cæteros prætermittam, Irenæi tantum Lugdunenſis episcopi faciam mentionem: adversus quem vir eloquentissimus Dionysius, Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ pontifex, elegantem scribit librum, irridens mille annorum fabulam; et auream atque gemmatam in terris Jerusalem; instaurationem templi; hostiarum sanguinem; otium Sabbathi; circumcisionis injuriam, nuptias, partus, liberorum educationem, epularum delicias, et cunctarum gentium servitutem: rursusque bella, exercitus, ac triumphos,

‘Revelation literally, we must Judaize; if spiritually [or figuratively] as it is written, we shall seem to contradict many of the ancients, particularly Latins, Tertullian, Victorinus, Lactantius; and Greeks likewise, especially Irenæus bishop of Lyons, against whom Dionysius bishop of the church of Alexandria, a man of uncommon eloquence, wrote a curious piece, deriding the fable of a thousand years, and the terrestrial Jerusalem, adorned with gold and precious stones; rebuilding the temple, bloody (B) sacrifices, sabbatical rest, circumcision, marriages, lyings-in, nursing of children, dainty feasts, and servitude of the nations: and again, after this, wars, armies, triumphs, and slaughters of conquered enemies, and the death of the sinner a hundred years old. Hm Apollinarius answered in two volumes, whom not only the men of his own sect, but most of our own people likewise follow in this point. So that it is no hard matter to foresee, what a multitude of persons I am like to displease.’ Thus writes Jerom.

And it must be owned, that the orthodox Chiliaists, or Millenarians, do speak of a thousand ^h years reign of Christ before the general resurrection; which good men, having been raised up from the dead, should spend on this earth; when there shall be ⁱ an extraordinary plenty of the fruits of the earth; when also ^k they shall feast upon them; when ^l Jerusalem shall be rebuilt; when likewise there will be marriages and bringing forth of children: but that they believed marriage and fruits of marriage to

et superatorum neces, mortemque centenarii peccatoris. Cui duobus voluminibus respondit Apollinarius, quem non solum suæ sectæ homines, sed et nostrorum in hac parte dumtaxat plurima sequitur multitudo; ut præfaga mente jam cernam, quantorum in me rabies concitanda sit. Hieron. in Es. l. 18. in Procem. p. 477, 478. Ed. Bened. (B) bloody sacrifices.] Those words deserve to be taken notice of, as affording a remarkable instance of agreement between the millennium of the orthodox Christians (of which Jerom here speaks) and of Cerinthus, as above described. See p. 105. ^h Verum ille, cum deleverit iniustitiam, iudiciumque maximum fecerit, ac iustos, qui a principio fuerunt, ad vitam instauraverit, mille annis inter homines versabitur, eosque iustissimo imperio reget. Lactant. l. vii. cap. 24. p. 722. Eodem tempore fiet secunda illa et publica omnium resurrectio, in qua excitabuntur iniusti ad cruciatus sempiternos. id. cap. 25. p. 728. f.

Conf. Iren. l. v. cap. 31. et seqq.

ⁱ Sol autem septies tanto, quam nunc est, clarior fiet. Terra vero aperiet fecunditatem suam, et uberrimas fruges sua sponte generabit. Rupes montium melle sudabunt: per rivos vina decurrent, et flumina lacte inundabunt. Lact. ib. cap. 24. p. 724. Conf. Iren. ib. cap. 35. n. 3. ^k . . . non facient omne terrenum opus, sed adjacentem habebunt paratam mensam a Deo pascentem eos epulis omnibus. Iren. ib. n. 2. Tales itaque promissiones manifestissime in regno iustorum istius creature epulationem significant. id. cap. 34. n. 1. Et hoc est triclinium, in quo recumbent ii, qui epulantur vocati ad nuptias. cap. 36. n. 2. Vivent itaque homines tranquillissimam vitam, et copiosissimam. Lact. ib. cap. 24. p. 726. in. ^l Hæc autem talia universa non in supercœlestibus possunt intelligi: . . . sed in regni temporibus revocata terra a Christo, et reedificata Hierusalem, secundum characterem quæ sursum est Hierusalem. Iren. ib. cap. 35. n. 2.

belong

belong to any of the raised saints, does not appear to me a clear point. Origen, ^m and ⁿ some others, speak as if this was the expectation of the Chiliafts, even of such as were orthodox, as it seems, at least of ^o some of them: which Origen therefore ^p mentions with great concern of mind, being apprehensive that such an opinion, if known by the heathens, might be a reproach upon the Christian religion. And ^q St. Jerom, immediately after the words just cited from him, insinuates the same thing of the orthodox Millenareans of his time: for which reason he reminds them of the saying of our Lord and Saviour, Matt. xxii. 29. 30. *Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage: but are as the angels of God.* Jerom ^{qq} writes to the same purpose in another place of his Commentaries upon the same prophet: but ^r Irenæus and ^s Lactantius, who were Millenarians, do not express themselves in that manner: what they say is, that at the time of the first resurrection there will be found some good men living upon the earth, and that of them in the space of a thousand years shall be born a numerous race, a godly seed; over whom likewise the raised saints are to reign, and by whom they are to be served. Pleasing delusion!

^m Vid. Orig. de Princ. l. ii. cap. 11. n. 2. p. 104. Bened. et Comm. in Matth. p. 498. E. Huet. ⁿ ap. Phot. Cod. 232. 4. 893. n. 10. ^o και μιᾷ γενεᾷ αἰών.

... ἰσθίου ἡμᾶς μέλλειν τα τοιαυτὰ ἔργα, καὶ ποιῶν τινος δὲ καὶ τεκνοποιῶν. Philoc. cap. 26. p. 99. Cantabr. Select. in Psal. p. 570. B. C. Bened. ^p ταῦτα δὲ φθακεῖα καὶ ἡς τῆς ἀπο τῶν ἰβίων, μεγάλης ευχίας δόξαν ἀπεικασθαι ποιῶσι τοὺς χριστιανισμοῦ, πολλὰ ἐλλείονα δογματὰ ἔχοντων τῶν ἀλλοτρῶν τῆς πίστεως. Orig. ib.

^q Quibus non invideo, si tantum amant terram, ut in regno Christi terrena desiderant; et post ciborum abundantiam, gulæque ac ventris ingluviem, ea quæ sub ventre sunt querant. De quibus apostolus Paulus: *Esca, inquit, ventri; et venter ejus: Deus autem et hunc et illas destruet.* [1 Cor. vi. 13.] Et, *non est regnum Dei cibus et potus.* [Rom. xiv 17.] Et Dominus atque Salvator: *Erratis, inquit, nescientes scripturas, neque virtutem Dei. In resurrectione enim neque nubent, neque nubentur: sed erunt similes angelorum.* Hieron. ibid. ^{qq} Nunc breviter perstringendum est, quid plurimi de hoc loco sentiant, ... Judæi et nostri Semijudæi, qui auream atque gemmatam de cælo ex-

pectant Jerusalem, hæc in mille annorum regno futura contendunt: quando omnes gentes servitutæ sunt Israel. ... et omnes oves Cedar congregentur; arietesque Nebajoth veniant, ut immolentur super altare templi, quod fuerit extructum. De insulis quoque, et maxime navibus Tharhis, volare filias illius et columbas, auri et argenti divitiis conferentes. ... Hæc illi dicunt, qui terrenas desiderant voluptates, et uxorum quærunt pulchritudinem, ac numerum liberorum. Hieron. Comm. in Is. cap. 60. 1, 2, 3, &c. p. 446, 447.

^r ... et illos quos Dominus in carne inveniet, expectantes eum de cælis, et perpeßos tribulationem, qui et effugerint iniqui manus: Ipsi sunt, de quibus ait propheta: *Et derelicti multiplicabuntur in terra.* Et quotquot ex credentibus ad hoc præparavit Deus, ad derelictos multiplicandos in terra, et sub regno sanctorum fieri, et ministrare huic Jerusalem, &c. Iren. l. v. cap. 35. sub. init. ^s Tum qui erunt in corporibus vivi, non morientur; sed per eosdem mille annos infinitam multitudinem generabunt; et erit eorum soboles sancta, et Deo cara. Qui autem ab inferis fuscitantur, ii præerunt viventibus, velut judices. Lact. ib. cap. 24. init. p. 721.

But I add no more at present relating to this matter. I shall only refer in the margin ^t to some ancient writers, beside those already cited, who may be consulted by such as have leisure.

However, I would now mention a few observations relating to the passage of Dionysius under consideration.

1. I am now better satisfied than (c) formerly, that when Caius spoke of a book of Revelations, which he ascribed to Cerinthus, he meant our Revelation written by John.

2. I take it for granted, that by some of the arguments above alleged, it has been fully shewn, that the supposition of the Revelation having been written by Cerinthus is without foundation.

3. The descriptions of the millennium of Cerinthus, and of the catholic Christians, as given by those who were not Millennarians, is much the same.

4. Therefore it is of no importance to shew, that the Revelation does not establish Cerinthus's notion of the millennium; for neither does it, in the opinion of most learned men among the moderns, confirm the notions which some ancient catholics had of a millennium: though they certainly grounded their sentiments upon the Revelation, and upon other books of the Old and New Testament, universally received.

5. It follows likewise, that there is not, as ^u Mr. Lampe thought, any good ground to conclude, that Cerinthus corrupted and interpolated the genuine Revelation of St. John, to support his fond expectation of a thousand years to be spent in nuptial festivities, and other such like sensual enjoyments: for many catholic, or orthodox Christians, had the same expectations, though they used our book of Revelation pure and uncorrupted. There might be likewise other arguments insisted on to shew, that this supposition is groundless and fictitious; as, that Cerinthus is not charged by the ancients with this crime of interpolating the Revelation; and, that if he had interpolated and altered this book to make it favourable to his notions about an expected millen-

^t Vid. Just. M. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 307. et seq. Paris. Euseb. H. E. l. iii. cap. 24. Gennad. de Ecc. Dogm. ap. August. in app. T. iii. cap. 55. Ed. Lovan. in app. T. viii. cap. 25. Ed. Bened. Tertullian. Contr. Marc. l. iii. cap. 24. Philastr. Hær. 59. De Chilonetitis, p. 119. Ed. Fabric. (c) See Vol. ii. ch. 32.

^u Hanc inter alia inde subnatum auguror, quod Cerinthus Hæreticus Apocalypsin Apostoli quibusdam in locis, præsertim ubi ultima ecclesiæ fata proponuntur,

corruperit, quam corruptam alii cum ipsa Joannis Apocalypsi confuderunt. Fr. Ad. Lampe Proleg. in Joann. l. i. cap. 7. n. 29. p. 129. Jam vero nostra Apocalypsis nihil habet de regno Millenario Hierosolymis erigendo, neque de voluptatibus corporis aut festis nuptialibus mille annorum spatio continuandis. . . . Neque tamen prorsus aliam, sed certis tantum locis corruptam, atque ad Cerinthis mentem accommodatam fuisse colligo. ib. p. 130.

nium, he would also have made it agreeable to his other peculiar sentiments, of which he was equally fond.

We have now considered the objections of some before Dionysius, which he does not adopt.

7. We are in the next place to consider Dionysius's own objections, which seem to be more material.

The general design of Dionysius's argument is, that the writer of the Revelation is not John the son of Zebedee, one of Christ's twelve apostles, writer of the Gospel and the first Catholic epistle, because the Revelation differs very much from those other pieces in several respects.

1. The evangelist nowhere puts down his name, neither in the gospel, nor in the epistle: but the writer of the Revelation mentions himself by name more than once. To this it is answered as follows:

1. Though St. John has not expressly named himself in his gospel, he has there so^w described himself, as that it is impossible not to know him: and, as for the epistles, they to whom they were sent could not be ignorant from whom they came.

2. The other evangelists have forbore to mention their names, as well as John: nor is there any name prefixed to the epistle to the Hebrews.

3. The character of a prophet is different from that of an evangelist. The apostle might omit his name in his other writings, and yet put it here; where, indeed, he was obliged to put it in conformity to the ancient prophets, who had inserted their names at the beginning, and in other parts of their prophecies: and above all, Daniel frequently mentions himself, whose manner the apocalyptic writer useth more than that of any other ancient prophet whatever.

But I question whether this last observation can be allowed, as fully satisfactory; for if the apostle, who had omitted his name in his other works, mentioned it here in imitation of Daniel, and other ancient prophets, why did he not also specify the time of his prophecies or visions, by declaring the reign, and year of the reign, of the prince or emperor in whose time they were received, as is usual with the ancient prophets, and * Daniel in particular?

2. Dionysius objects, that though the writer of the Revelation calls himself John, yet he has not shewn us, that he is the

^w See John xxi. 24. and other places.

* See Daniel ch. vii. 1, 2. viii. 1. ix. 12. x. 1, xi. 1.

apostle; for he does not say, as in the gospel, that he is the disciple whom the Lord loved, nor who leaned on his breast, nor the brother of James, nor that he is one of them that saw the Lord; whereas he would have mentioned some of these particulars, if he had intended to discover himself, and to have it thought that he was the apostle of that name. To this several things may be ^y replied.

1. The author of the Revelation calls himself John, without any farther distinction, and therefore he is likely to be the principal person of that name then living; that is, John the evangelist: for such an one is ordinarily and sufficiently distinguished by his bare name, and needs no additions; but when a person inferior to others of the same name is mentioned, common perspicuity requires an additional title to prevent mistake. Since therefore, throughout the Apocalypse, the person that saw the visions, and committed them to writing, is barely styled John it is obvious thence to imagine, that none but John the apostle an evangelist is meant by that name.

2. The ^z author of the Revelation was one who had *borne record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus, and of the things which he had seen*: Rev. i. 2. It is added, 'That ^a the concluding words of this verse, *the things which he saw*, undoubtedly appropriate all that goes before to John the apostle; for had any John then living seen the transactions of the gospel, save John the apostle?'

So Mr. Twells. But all those words may be very properly understood (^{*}) of this book, the Revelation, or the things contained in it; for the book begins thus, chap. i. v. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass: and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John.* Then in the second verse the writer says, that he discharged his office in this book, having

^y See, beside Mill. Prolegomena, n. 374. Mr. Twells, as before, Part iii. p. 21, &c. ^z See Mr. Twells, as before, p. 22, 23. ^a *ibid.* (^{*}) The note of Mrs. de Beaufobre and Lenfant upon those words is this; 'Who bare record of the Word of God and of the testimony of Jesus Christ.' See 1 John i. 1. and John xxi. 24. For though it is not certain that the gospel of St. John was then written, it sufficeth, that the apostle had by word of mouth preached the same things that are in his gospel. "This place," says St. Ambrose, "shews, that this book was

"not written by any other John than he who wrote the gospel." Nevertheless these words may be also applied to the Apocalypse itself. On peut pourtant aussi rapporter ces paroles à l'Apocalypse même. It ought to be remarked, that the piece from whence that observation is taken, is not really St. Ambrose's, though sometimes ascribed to him, but the work of some writer of the eighth century, or later, as those commentators well knew; but for brevity sake, I suppose, they quoted it by the name of St. Ambrose. Vid. Ambrosii Opera. T. ii. p. 497, 498, 499. in App.

therein faithfully recorded the word of God, received from Jesus Christ, and all the visions he had seen, v. 2. *Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw.* This seems a very natural and obvious sense of these words; and that it is the real design and meaning of them, may be confirmed by comparing them with the beginnings of some of the books of the ancient Jewish prophets; as II. i. 1. *The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos, which he saw. . . . Ezek. i. 3. 4. The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel the priest, . . . and I looked. . . .* In these words therefore the writer, after the manner of many other good writers, sets before his readers, in brief, the design and substance of the whole book.

3. 'The^b Revelation is the work of that John who was in the isle of Patmos for the testimony of the gospel, which was then the peculiar case of John the apostle: which circumstance not only agrees with the history of John the evangelist, but is also peculiar to him, and marks him out as effectually as if he had been expressly so called; for^c the ancients declare, that this John was banished in the latter end of Domitian's reign to that island; but we do not find, from ecclesiastical monuments, that any other named John was at that time banished into the isle of Patmos.'

I have been unwilling to omit this observation; but perhaps some will think it not very properly mentioned in this place. They may say, that this serves to shew that some ancient writers did own the Revelation was written by the apostle John; and it would be fitly enough insisted on in an account of their testimonies concerning it; but it ought not to be mentioned as a distinct consideration: for those writers, supposing this book to have been written by John the apostle, concluded thence that he was banished into the island of Patmos.

4. 'The^d epistle of John to the seven churches of the Minor, or Proconsular Asia, and consequently the Revelation itself, was most probably written by that John who had the immediate and particular care of those churches; namely, John the apostle: for the presidency of our apostle is a fact attested by early antiquity. Eusebius^e tells us from tradition, that, upon the dispersion of the apostles, Asia fell to John's lot: and as

^b Mr. Twells, as before, p. 24.

^c See Clem. Alex. in his book, *Quis Dives salvetur*. cap. 42. p. 959. Tertul.

^d de Praef. Haer. c. 36. Euseb. Chron. ad ann. Domit. 14. and H. E. l. iii. c.

^e 18. 20. Of the same mind were Epi-

^f phanius and Sulpitius Severus, and Jerome in Cat. V. l. and in l. i. contr. Jovin. c. 14. So Mr. Twells in a note p. 24.

^g Mr. Twells, p. 25. ^h Hist. Ec. l. iii. c. 1.

‘Ephesus was the principal city of the province, there John chiefly resided; visiting and directing the neighbouring churches, as occasion required.’

These things therefore may be reckoned sufficient to signify to every one who is the author of this book. He calls himself John; he is one who bore record of the word of God; he had been in the isle of Patmos for the testimony of Jesus; he writes to the seven churches of Asia, where the apostle and evangelist is supposed to have presided.

So it has been argued by learned men; and certainly these are particulars that deserve consideration, though they be not all of equal importance, as has been shewn in passing along. They are of use to weaken this objection of Dionysius; but whether they confute and overthrow his argument, I cannot certainly say. It had been very easy, in my opinion, for the apostle to design, or describe himself in a more peculiar and distinguishing manner, if indeed he was the author of this book: and since the writer of the Revelation, as Dionysius observes, nameth himself more than once, and calleth himself our brother and companion, and says he was in Patmos for the testimony of Jesus; why did he not somewhere say, that he was the disciple whom Jesus loved, or who leaned upon his breast; and that he was an eye-witness of the word, or of the sufferings of Jesus; or plainly call himself apostle? As the writer seems willing enough to characterise, and describe himself, it may be thought somewhat strange that he has not plainly expressed some such characteristics as these, if they belonged to him.

3. Dionysius objects, that the Revelation does not mention the catholic epistle, nor the epistle the Revelation.

But I think this observation to be of little moment: for, not to say any thing here about the exact time of writing any of these pieces, of the gospel, or the fore-mentioned epistle of St. John, or the Revelation, nor which was first or which last written; it is not the custom of the sacred writers to quote themselves, or refer to their own works. When they write more than one epistle to the same churches, or persons, they make mention of their former epistle to those churches or persons; this is natural, and it is done by St. Paul: but in his epistle to the Romans, though he had then written several epistles, he does not there say any thing of those former epistles.

4. Dionysius argues, that there is a great likeness of sentiment and expression between the gospel and catholic epistle of John; but that the Revelation is quite different, without any affinity

p. 708
affinit
mon t
said.

1.
is alt
it to l
assert
from
simpl
and f

2.
differ
ings
Nay,
‘of f
‘unc
‘is f
‘wer
‘tol
‘nat
learn
‘of C
‘gosp
‘his
‘he
‘Job
‘nan
‘ful
‘true
‘v. 2
‘and
‘vi.
‘and
‘of S
‘rele
‘fait
‘to k
‘gof
‘ny
‘abo

‘See
‘Apo
p. 112

affinity or resemblance, not having so much as a syllable common to them. By way of reply to this, several things have been said.

1. As, that ^f this argument, taken from the difference of style, is altogether insignificant, and of no consequence; for allowing it to be true, that there were as great a difference as Dionysius asserts, every body knows, that the style of history is different from that of an epistle or a prophecy. The style of history is simple; of an epistle, familiar; and that of prophecy is grand and sublime, as certainly is the style of the Revelation.

2. Another ^g part of the answer is, by denying the fact. The difference between the Revelation and the acknowledged writings of St. John is not so great as represented by Dionysius. Nay, it is said, 'there ^h is in many instances a conformity both of sentiment and expression between the Revelation and the uncontested writings of John the apostle: and this agreement is so remarkable, as to be itself no bad argument, that they were all written by one hand; for how else could there be any tolerable resemblance of this sort in writings of so different a nature?' Divers such coincidences have been observed by ⁱ learned men. 'In ^k the Revelation, (chap. xix. 13.) it is said of Christ, that *his name is called the Word of God*; and in the gospel of St. John he is styled the Word, (ch. i. 1.) and in his first epistle *the Word of life*: ch. i. 1. In the Revelation he is called the Lamb, (ch. v. 6. 12.) and in the gospel of St. John, the *Lamb of God*; ch. i. 29. 36. In the Revelation the name of Christ is, *He that is true*: ch. iii. 7. . . . *he that is faithful and true*; (xix. 11.) and in the gospel of St. John, *he that is true*. . . . *full of truth*, (ch. i. 14.) and the *truth*: xiv. 6. 1 John v. 20. In the Revelation, manna is applied to spiritual food; and so it is applied in the gospel of St. John: Rev. ii. 7. John vi. 32. In the Revelation it is said, *And every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him*; (Rev. i. 7.) and in the gospel of St. John, from the prophet Zachary, *They shall look on him whom they pierced*: John xix. 37. In the Revelation Christ saith, *If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me*: Rev. iii. 20. In the gospel of St. John, *If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him*: ch. xiv. 23.'

^f See Beausobre and Lenfant Preface sur l'Apocalypse, p. 607. ^g Mr. Twells, p. 112. ^h Mr. Twells, as before.

ⁱ Vid. Mill. Proleg. n. 176, 177.

^k See the bishop of London's Third Pastoral Letter. p. 59, 60.

These

These are instances of agreement between the Revelation and the confessed writings of St. John, which are commonly insisted on; but I own I have scruples with regard to divers of these instances. May I then be allowed to propose some difficulties upon this head, and go over again each of these particulars? When I have done so, I will add a few other.

1. 'In Rev. xix. 13. Christ is called the *Word of God*.' But there is no parallel to that expression that I know of in St. John's confessed writings. Indeed, at the beginning of his gospel, he speaks of the Word, and at the beginning of his first epistle of the Word of life: but still here is a difference. Mr. Twells¹ says, 'in Rev. xix. 13. Christ is termed *the Word of God*; and every one knows that he is more frequently so styled 'in the uncontested writings of St. John than elsewhere.' But though Mr. Twells says 'every one knows this,' I must entreat him to make an exception for me till somebody has shewn me the several texts of St. John's uncontested writings, where Christ is so called, for at present I do not know of one.

2. 'Then Christ is called the Lamb of God in the gospel of St. John, and the Lamb in the Revelation.' But here is no exact resemblance; for in the gospel Christ is called the Lamb of God; in the Revelation the Lamb. In the gospel Christ is but twice only called the Lamb of God, and that by John the baptist; but in the Revelation he is very frequently called the Lamb. And, besides, he is compared to a lamb in other books of the New Testament; as 1 Pet. i. 19. See likewise Acts viii. 32.

3. 'In Rev. iii. 7. 14. and again ch. xix. 11. Christ is^m emphatically styled *ὁ ἀληθινός*, he that is true. And the very same character is given to him, 1 John v. 20. See also John i. 14. and xiv. 6. But such expressions occur no where else.' So argues Mr. Twells. And it may be owned that this is somewhat remarkable: but still, as Dionysius observed, the word Truth, so common in St. John's gospel and epistles, is wanting in the Revelation. And it may be said, that equivalent things are found in the writings of St. Paul, and other books of the New Testament; as when Paul says of Christ, (1 Tim. vi. 13.) that *before Pontius Pilate he witnessed a good confession*; and when the gospel is called the truth, or the word of truth, as it often is. And even insidious enemies were obliged to give our Lord the character of a sincere teacher of truth, as recorded Matt. xxii. 16. *Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth.* See also Mark xii. 14.

¹ As before, p. 28.

^m See Mr. Twells, p. 28.

4. 'In Rev. ii. 17. are these words; *To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the hidden manna.* And spiritual food is spoken of under the image of manna in John, vi.' But I cannot perceive these texts to be parallel: however, ^a Mr. Twells lays a good deal of stress upon this coincidence.

5. 'In Rev. i. 7. *Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail, because of him.* In Zach. xii. 10. are these words; *And they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him.* . . . And that text is cited John xix. 37. *And again, another scripture saith: They shall look on him whom they pierced;* but no ^o where else in the New Testament.' But I would observe, that in the Revelation there is no citation as in St. John's gospel: and the text of the Revelation suits as well a text of St. Matthew's as of St. John's gospel; *And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory:* Matt. xxiv. 30.

6. 'In Rev. iii. 20. our Lord promiseth the obedient; *I will come unto him, and sup with him, and he with me.* And so in the gospel of St. John xiv. 23. *I and my Father will come unto him, and will make our abode with him.*' It must be allowed that here is some resemblance: nevertheless, it would have been a great pleasure to see in the Revelation the word *abode*, or *abide*, so common in St. John's gospel and first epistle.

7. Farther, 'Rev. i. 5. *Unto him that hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.* So the apostle John, 1 John i. 7. *And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.*' But this coincidence appears to me to be of very small moment; because the love of Christ in washing, or cleansing, or redeeming, or saving us from our sins by his blood or death, is a subject insisted on in every book of the New Testament, and could not be omitted by any Christian writer or speaker in the early days of the gospel.

To these coincidences, insisted on by others, Mr. Twells has added several more. And, besides, he proceeds still farther, adding some propositions, and supporting them by various examples under each. His propositions are these: 'First, the sameness of construction and acceptation of words in the Revelation, and the unquestionable writings of St. John, and which are less frequent with the other sacred penmen, makes

^a See him, p. 27, 28.

^o See Mr. Twells, p. 27.

^p As before, p. 30.

‘ it extremely probable that one person was the author of them
 ‘ all. Secondly, there^a are many instances in the Revelation
 ‘ of construction and acceptation of words altogether peculiar to
 ‘ John the evangelist, which demonstrate he wrote that book.’
 So Mr. Twells. But I have not room for his particular instances;
 and he may be read not only in his own English, but likewise in
 Mr. Wolff’s fourth^r volume of *Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ*
 upon the New Testament; Mr. Wolff having translated a large
 part of Mr. Twells’s work into Latin entire, and the rest of it
 in the way of a copious abridgment.

I shall, however, transcribe here a particular or two.

8. One of the coincidences observed by Mr. Twells, additional to those above mentioned, is this: ‘ In Rev. iii. 21. Christ
 ‘ says, *Εγὼ νενικησα*, *I have overcome*. Just as he declares, Joh. xvi. 33.
 ‘ *Εγὼ νενικηκα τὸν κόσμον*, *I have overcome the world*. Again, Christian firmness under trials is frequently called *overcoming* in the
 ‘ second and third chapters of the Revelation, as it is also 1 Joh.
 ‘ ii. 13. 14. iv. 4. v. 5. language peculiar to St. John.’

I would add likewise two instances of construction and acceptation of words, which^t Mr. Twells reckons altogether peculiar to John the evangelist.

9. ‘ In Rev. ii. 26. *He^u that keepeth my works unto the end.*
 ‘ Here^w works, says Mr. Twells, is plainly put for^x words:
 ‘ and so Grotius upon the place; but we nowhere find the like
 ‘ acceptation of this word, save in John xiv. 10. *The^y words*
 ‘ *which I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but my Father that*
 ‘ *dwelleth in me, he doth the works*. Here is an opposition of sense,
 ‘ which cannot be made out, unless we suppose, that speaking
 ‘ words and doing works mean the same thing. The sense
 ‘ therefore of the passage is this: The words which I speak are
 ‘ not merely my own, but my Father which dwelleth in me, he
 ‘ is the joint author of them. And this sense our Lord gives us
 ‘ in express terms, v. 24. of this chapter: *The word, which ye*
 ‘ *hear, is not mine, but my Father’s which sent me*. And, again ch.
 ‘ viii. 28. *I do nothing of myself, but as my Father has taught me, so*
 ‘ *I speak*.’

10. ‘ *Keeping^z the word, or words*, is an expression not uncommon in the Revelation; see ch. iii. 8. 10, xxii. 7. 9. But in
 ‘ no other book of the New Testament do we meet with it, ex-

^a ib. p. 32. ^r p. 387, &c. ^s See *εμὴν, ἀπ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ἔρχεται ὁ δὲ πατήρ ὁ ὢν*
 Mr. Twells, p. 29. ^t ibid. p. 32. *ἐμοὶ μόνῳ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα.*
^u *ἐργα.* ^w *ἐργα.* ^x *Τὴν λέγον ἢ λόγους.*
^y *λόγους.* ^z *Τὰ ῥήματα α ἢ ῥα λαλῶ*

‘ cept

‘ 52.

Twells

Matt.

and p

whatfo

of the

John’s

and fo

the ve

writer

or won

very r

3.

fius’s

ing th

ledge

it. M

part o

observ

light,

gospel

the R

critic

book.

throw

An

large

John

Reve

not d

says,

‘ affi

‘ hat

only

does

in hi

of Jo

denie

Tho

do n

It

critic

‘ ib.

‘cept in St. John’s gospel and first epistle; see John viii. 51. ‘52. 55. xiv. 23. 24. xv. 20. xvii. 6. 1 Joh. ii. 5.’ So ^a Mr. Twells. However, the phrase, *keeping the commandments*, is in Matt. xix. 17. St. Matthew has the same verb in other places, and particularly xxviii. 20. *Teaching them to observe* [or keep] *whatsoever I have commanded you*: that verb is also in other books of the New Testament; and *keeping Christ’s commandments* is in John’s gospel, as xiv. 15. 21. xv. 10. and often in his first epistle, and sometimes in the Revelation, as ch. xii. 17. xiv. 12. So that the verb *Keep*, τηρεω, is oftener used by St. John than any other writer of the New Testament, and the phrase *keeping Christ’s word*, or *words* by him alone; but yet, perhaps, this peculiarity is not very remarkable.

3. I have now enlarged upon this part of the answer to Dionysius’s argument, which consists in denying the fact, and in shewing that the difference between the Revelation and the acknowledged writings of St. John is not so great as he has represented it. Nevertheless it must be owned, as I apprehend, that this part of his critique is just and true in the main; for Dionysius observed, that there are certain words, or expressions, such as *light*, *life*, *truth*, and several others, very common in St. John’s gospel and epistle, but not to be found at all, or very rarely, in the Revelation. Nor have any of our modern sharp-sighted critics been able to shew those expressions in this last mentioned book, nor with all their industry directly to confute and overthrow that observation.

And perhaps Dionysius’s collection of this kind might be enlarged; for the verb μενω, *abide*, or *dwell*, is very common in St. John’s gospel ^b and first epistle, but scarce occurs at all in the Revelation, except one place, ch. xvii. 10. which I suppose does not deserve particular notice here. Moreover, as Mr. Blackwall says, ‘St. John often takes one thing two ways, both in the affirmative and negative; 1 Joh. v. 12. *He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son, hath not life.*’ This is the only example alleged by Mr. Blackwall; but he says St. John does so often; and it is certain there are several such instances in his ^c first and ^d second epistle, and others in his gospel. Thus of John the baptist he writes; (Joh. i. 20.) *And he confessed, and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ.* And our Lord says to Thomas, (chap. xx. 27.) *And be not faithless, but believing*; but I do not remember such forms of speaking in the Revelation.

It may be also said to the advantage of Dionysius, that his critique does not consist of minute particulars, but of such things

^a ib. p. 333.

^b See Sac. Classics, Vol. i. p. 333.

^c See 1 John i. 5, 6. iv. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8.

^d 2 John, ver. 9.

as are very considerable, and must hold, I think, as proofs of a great agreement of sentiments and expressions between St. John's gospel and first epistle, and of a remarkable difference of the Revelation and the unquestioned writings of the evangelist.

Mr. Blackwall however says, 'The ^c Revelation is written much in the same style with St. John's gospel and epistles.' On the contrary, Joachim Camerarius says, 'The ^f difference of the style of the Revelation from that of the gospel and epistle is manifest, and may be easily perceived by any one who has attained to only a moderate knowledge of the Greek language.' And he ^g speaks of these critical remarks of Dionysius in terms of great respect.

Beza likewise, in his preface to the Revelation, having answered divers objections to the genuineness of this book, concludes; 'that ^h he cannot but think it most probable, that it was written by John the apostle: but that if a conjecture was to be made from the style, who else could be reckoned most likely to be the writer; he should think of Mark, who was also called John, there being a great resemblance in words, phrases, and manner of writing, between this book and Mark's gospel.'

And this I suppose to be the more general opinion of learned men, that there is a considerable difference of sentiments and words and manner in the Revelation and the acknowledged pieces of the apostle John, whatever this difference is owing to; whether it be that these writings are not all the compositions of one and the same author; or that it is entirely owing to the diversity of subject and design, which was mentioned (d) formerly, or to some other cause. I shall, however, mention another thing to be considered. If there were any reason to think that there was some considerable distance of time between the composing of any of these books, that might be one good way of accounting for differences of style; for it is not unlikely that one and the same person, writing upon different arguments, and at a great distance of time, especially if he be one who does

^c As before, p. 334.

^f Sane orationem huius dissimilem esse ejus, qua conscripta extat Evangelii expositio et Epistolæ compositio, evidens est, atque perspicitur facile ab aliquo, qui non etiam peritissimus linguæ Græcæ, sed illius mediocrem saltem notitiam consecutus est studio suo. Joach. Camer. ad Apoc.

^g Sed nihil est opus nostra disputatione longiore, cum, ut opinor, ea, quæ debent et possint dici de hoc libro, existent commemorata in libro vii. Historiæ Eusebii, excerpta ex quadam epistola Dionysii A-

lexandrini. Id. ib.

^h Quæ cum ita se habeant, quamvis non censuerim quidem ego pertinacius de scriptoris nomine litigandum, tamen Johanni apostolo potius quam cuiquam alii hunc librum tribuerim. . . . Quod si quid aliud liceret ex stylo con-jicere, nemini certe potius quam Marco tribuerim, qui et ipse Johannes dictus est: adeo non in verbis tantum, sed etiam in formulis dicendi plerisque similis, ac pen-
idem est Evangelii Marci et hujus libri character. Bez. Pr. in Apoc.

(d) See p. 121.

not frequently exercise his style, or write in the intermediate space, should have a very different manner in his several performances.

Thus far then of the argument concerning difference of sentiment and expression.

5. Dionysius's last objection is founded upon the diction or language of the Revelation: for he says that the gospel and epistle of John are written correctly, and not only according to the propriety of the Greek tongue, but with elegance of phrase, argument, and composition; quite free from barbarism and solecism, and even idiotism of language: but the writer of the Revelation discovers no accurate skill in the Greek tongue; on the contrary, he has barbarisms, and some solecisms.

In answer to this, several things have been said by learned men of late times; for Mill ⁱ allows that there are solecisms in the Revelation. It is a thing, he says, too manifest to be denied; but then, as he adds, the other writers of the New Testament are not free from the like defects; no, not John the evangelist, the purity and elegance of whose language is so commended by Dionysius. Mr. Twells's ^k answer here is to the like purpose. 'We do not pretend,' he says, 'to assert that the language of the Revelation is pure Greek.' But he is persuaded that it is now much worse than when Dionysius passed his censure upon it: nay, he supposeth that there were not half the solecisms in the copies of Dionysius's times that now occur in the printed copies; and that our printed copies abound with solecisms. But then, as the Greek of the Revelation was always far from being pure, so Dionysius has beyond measure extolled that of St. John's gospel and canonical epistle, which has it's faults likewise.

So write those two learned men. But Mr. ^l Blackwall blames Dr. Mill for striking in so far with Dionysius as to allow there is false Greek and solecism in the Revelation; and he offers solutions of several constructions in that book which have been supposed ungrammatical: and Mr. Wolff, in a note ^m upon his Latin translation of this part of Mr. Twells's work, gives a caution against receiving that supposition, that there are solecisms in the Revelation.

Thus critics are divided upon points of this nature. I think, therefore, we may set aside this part of the argument until they are better agreed among themselves.

ⁱ Et certe Apocalypsen subinde minus Græce scribere, etiam et *σολοικισμῶν*, notius est quam ut negari possit. Proleg. n. 179.

^k As before, p. 113, 114, 115.

^l See Sacred Classics, Vol. i. p. 140. . .

142.

^m Cave, heic Twelfii judicium probes. Omnem enim solæcismorum suspensionem ab illis, qui illorum postulantur, locis alienam esse infra ex notis apparebit.

Wolf. Cur. T. iv. p. 417.

Before that is done it seems needless to inquire after the reasons of the imperfections of the language of the Revelation, or to examine those reasons which have been assigned. However, to observe somewhat briefly relating to this matter may not be amiss. Mr. Twellsⁿ says, 'That if this book be found to have rather more of these imperfections than St. John's other writings, two causes may be assigned for it. First, that being of the prophetic sort, the Holy Ghost thought it most congruous to use the same forms of speech as the prophets of the Old Testament do, which occasions more Hebraisms in it. Secondly, as prophetic language is generally least cultivated in point of beauty and perspicuity, so we are not to wonder if the same negligence should appear in the grammar of it. A writer big with the mysteries he relates, may well be supposed less attentive to diction, than when he draws up a history or an epistle.' So Mr. Twells. 'As for the language of the Revelation,' says^o Tillemont, 'beside other reasons that might be alleged, may it not be said, that, being banished into Patmos, St. John had not by him the same persons he had at Ephesus to assist him in the choice of terms and expressions? And possibly, too, the power of the Spirit of God constrained him to write quickly what he had seen, without concerning himself about purity and elegance of speech, which are of no value in the sight of God.'

I own I have no great opinion of these reasons; but, as before observed, since learned men are not as yet agreed about the fact, there is no immediate necessity that we should scrupulously examine the supposed causes of it. I therefore pass on.

8. We are now to observe, after all, Dionysius's own opinion of the author of this book.

In this critique upon the Revelation he says, he dares not reject it: and we find that he actually made use of it in his writings. Eusebius informs us, that in a letter to Hermammion, speaking of Valerian and his persecution, Dionysius says: 'And^p John had a revelation to this purpose: *And there was given unto him, saith he, a mouth, speaking great things, and blasphemies: and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months.* Rev. xiii. 5. 'It is wonderful to see both these things in Valerian.' So Dionysius. This passage is a proof that the Revelation was then well known, and in great reputation.

ⁿ As before, p. 115, 116.

Mem. Ec. T. i. P. iii. p. 1089. St. Jean l'Evangeliste, note ix.

^o See *αὐτῷ, φησὶ, τόμα. . . .* *Ἀποστολὰ δὲ ἐστὶ τῆς*

οὐαδερμῶν βαυμασαι. ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 7. c. 10. init.

ἢ ὁμοίως ἀποκαλύπτεται· Καὶ ἰδοὺ γὰρ

Among these his critical observations he likewise acknowledged this book to be the work of some holy and divinely inspired person; but, he thinks, not the work of John the apostle the son of Zebedee; but, rather, of some other John who had his chief residence in Asia.

And certainly, Dionysius is in the right to own, that the writer was a truly good and holy man. I think the book itself puts that out of question.

Consequently also, he was divinely inspired; for he says, he *was in the Spirit*; Rev. i. 10. And the book is declared to be, or contain, (v. 1.) *the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John.* It is added afterwards, (v. 19.) *Write the things which thou hast seen.... and the things which shall be hereafter.* Again, (chap. iv. 1.) *I will shew thee things which must be hereafter.* It is also called (E) a *prophecy*. Now prophecy is not an human attainment, but the gift of God.

Nevertheless, Dionysius thinks it not the writing of the apostle, but of some other John, whom he does not certainly know, but probably of that other John who is said to have had his residence in Asia, there being two tombs at Ephesus with that name.

Against this supposition should be observed all the arguments above mentioned relating to the inscription; that there are many ancient writers who receive the Revelation as the writing of John the apostle and evangelist; that we have no particular account of any John having been an exile in the isle of Patmos about that time, except John the apostle; and the writer calling himself John without any particular characteristics gives ground to conclude he is the principal person of that name then living: and it may be judged very unlikely that the Spirit of God should admonish and reprove the seven churches of Asia by John the elder, (allowing that there was such a person) whilst John the apostle was living and presided in those parts.

XVI. I suppose I have now paid a due regard to this critique of Dionysius: but before I proceed, I will take a brief review of it, and add two or three remarks.

This whole critique may be said to consist of three parts: objections of some before Dionysius; then his own objections; and, lastly, his own judgment or opinion.

(E) See Rev. ch. i. 3. xxii. 7. 10. 18. 19.

The objections of those before Dionysius I suppose to have been fully answered; and their opinion, that Cerinthus was the writer of the Revelation, confuted.

But Dionysius's own objections are more material: they are five in number. First, that the evangelist John has not named himself neither in his gospel nor in his catholic epistle, but the writer of the Revelation nameth himself more than once. Secondly, that though the writer of the Revelation calls himself John, he has not shewn us that he is the apostle of that name. Thirdly, that the Revelation does not mention the catholic epistle, nor that epistle the Revelation. Fourthly, that there is a great agreement in sentiment, expression, and manner, between St. John's gospel and epistle: but the Revelation is quite different in all these respects, without any resemblance or similitude. Fifthly, that the Greek of the gospel and epistle is pure and correct, but that of the Revelation has barbarisms and solecisms.

These are Dionysius's objections. The third we have supposed to be of little force. The fifth depending upon a matter of much niceness, about which very few are able to judge, and about which even the learned are not agreed, we have not much insisted upon it; nor did Dionysius enlarge, or enter into, particulars here. As for the first, several things have been alleged by way of answer to it; but whether that answer be full and complete, may be questioned. As for the second objection, several things also have been observed sufficient to weaken, if not to confute and overthrow it. With regard to the fourth objection it has been observed, that the subject matter and design of the Revelation being very different from those of the acknowledged pieces of the evangelist John, that must needs occasion some considerable difference in sentiment and expression; but that the difference is not so great as represented by Dionysius. Nevertheless, I am of opinion, that this difficulty has not been quite removed: and I must acknowledge, that the Revelation, when compared with the apostle's unquestioned writings, has an unlikeness not easy to be accounted for.

Dionysius's own opinion is, that the Revelation was written by some holy and inspired person named John; but who that John was he does not know: he might be John the elder, said to have resided for some time at Ephesus in Asia; but the reasons before mentioned satisfied Dionysius he could not be John the apostle. Of this judgment of our author we have lately spoken; and have now nothing more to add, beside the two following general remarks.

First,

First, If the writer of the Revelation be supposed not an apostle, then this book is greatly degraded, it's authority is lessened, and it can no longer be reputed canonical. Doubtless, Dionysius knew what he was about: he did not take all these pains to shew that the Revelation was not written by an apostle for no end and purpose. If the book of the Revelation was not the writing of an apostle, but of some other John, who at the most was only an elder, or a prophet, it's authority would be diminished; the Millenarians themselves, if they could be persuaded to come into this opinion, would not have retained the same value for it they had formerly, nor would they be quite so diligent in the study of it; nor would their adversaries, the Allegorists, pay so great a regard to any arguments or particular opinions founded upon it. In one word, then, this book would be no longer a part of the rule of faith and practice to Christian people.

Learned men therefore are in the right to produce every thing tending to justify and support the common opinion concerning the writer of this book, and to observe all evidences internal and external of it's being the work of John the apostle.

Secondly, as (F) I said before, It may be questioned whether this critique of Dionysius, or any other critique whatever, can be sufficient to create a doubt concerning the author of this book; which was owned for a writing of John the apostle and evangelist by many ancient writers before Dionysius and before Caius, and, so far as we know, before the most early of those who disputed it's genuineness. This observation is agreeable to the judgments of several very eminent men, ¹ Grotius, ² Flacius Illyricus, and ³ Socinus; whose words, in part at least, have

(F) See p. 109. ¹ Apostoli Johannis esse hunc librum credidere illi, quibus merito creditur, Justinus contra Tryphonem, Irenæus, Tertullianus adversus Marcionem iv. et aliis multis in locis: quibus consentiunt Clemens Alexandrinus, Origenes, Cyprianus, et post eos alii multi. Grot. Annot. in Tit. Apocal. ² Si iis imbeatur fides patribus, qui proprius ad hoc accesserunt seculum, uti certe æquissimum est, quales sunt Justinus, Tertullianus, Irenæus, Apollonius, Theophilus, Antiochenus. . . . affirmari poterit eam ut Johannis apostoli illo primo seculo habitam. Cur enim tam certo Johannis apostoli esse confirmarent, si dubias de ea ex illis sententiis antecessorum cognovissent?

Flac. Illyr. arg. in Apoc. ³ Non videtur propter parvam aliquam, aut etiam magnam dissimilitudinem rationis scribendi in universum ac styli ab aliis ejusdem Johannis scriptis longe diversi generis debere aut posse dubitari, quin ejus sit opus, maxime cum simul adsint tot alia testimonia. Socia. Lect. Sacr. p. 306. Quocirca non videtur, propter parvam, aut etiam magnam dissimilitudinem rationis scribendi in universum, ac styli ab aliis ejusdem Johannis scriptis longe diversi generis, (quæ omnium fortasse rationum potissima est, quæ asseruntur ad probandum scriptum illud non esse ipsius) debere aut posse dubitari quin ejus sit opus. Id. De Auct. Sacr. Scrip. cap. 1. n. ii. p. 169.

been alleged by ^t Mr. Simon in a like argument, and cannot be omitted in this work. It is likewise agreeable to the sentiment of ^u Stephen Le Moyne, ^w Mill, and other learned men, whose words need not to be transcribed at present.

XVII. Dionysius then received, as sacred and divine scriptures, the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the apostles, the epistles of Paul, and particularly the epistle to the Hebrews, as a writing of that apostle. Concerning the seven catholic epistles, we do not certainly know his judgment: but he has mentioned expressly and often the three epistles of the apostle John; the first as unquestionably genuine and received by all; the other two as well known. And it may be justly taken for granted that he received the first epistle of the apostle Peter, it having been all along universally received by catholic Christians. As for the rest we can say nothing positively of his opinion about them. The Revelation he allowed to be the work of John, a holy and divinely inspired person; but he was not satisfied that it was written by John the son of Zebedee, apostle and evangelist. However, in his argument concerning that book, he lets us know that it was then generally received by Christians as written by John the apostle. In Dionysius we have seen likewise evidences of that peculiar respect shewed by Christians to the sacred scriptures; which they looked upon as the rule of judgment in things of religion, by which all points in controversy were to be decided. And what those scriptures were he shews by these general titles and divisions of them; 'The Law and the Prophets, the Gospels and Epistles of Apostles.' Nor have we perceived, in the remaining works and fragments of this great and learned bishop of Alexandria, any marks of respect for any Christian apocryphal writings.

^t Hist. Crit. du Texte du N. T. c. 19.

^u Quod mirum, cum revera aliter senserint viri et antiquitate et meritis gravissimi ante Dionysium. Sic enim Justinus Martyr, exeunte seculo secundo. Sic Iacobi et fere lapso eodem seculo Theophilus Antiochenus, Clem. Alexandrinus, et Irenæus. Sic ineunte seculo tertio Origenes. Sic adulto eodem seculo Melito Sar-

denis episcopus. Qui omnes, Dionysio Alexandrino priores, et superiores, et aetati Johannis apostoli viciniore et propiores, illi apocalypsim constanter tribuerunt. Sic etiam Hippolytus noster, qui annis etiam plurimis aetatem Dionysii superavit. Le Moyne Var. Sacr. T. ii. p. 1014. ^w Mill. Prol. n. 227. . . . 229.

C H A P. XLIV.

CYPRIAN, bishop of Carthage.

- I. *His history, and character, and testimonies to him.* II. *His works.*
 III. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament; and, first, of the four gospels.* IV. *Of the Acts of the apostles.* V. *Of St. Paul's thirteen epistles.* VI. *Of the epistle to the Hebrews.* VII. *Of the catholic epistles.* VIII. *Of the Revelation.* IX. *Respect for the scriptures.* X. *General titles and divisions of the scriptures.* XI. *Of Christian apocryphal writings.* XII. *Of Jewish apocryphal writings.* XIII. *The sum of his testimony.*

I. THE account which St. Jerom has given of St. Cyprian, in his book of *Illustrious Men*, is but short. It is to this purpose: 'Cyprian^a of Africa first taught rhetoric with great applause. Afterwards, being converted to Christianity by a presbyter named Cæcilius, whose name he also took, he gave all his estate to the poor; and after no long time he was made presbyter, and then bishop of Carthage. It is needless to give a catalogue of his works, which are brighter than the sun. He suffered under the emperor Valerian and Gallienus, in the eighth persecution, the same day that Cornelius died at Rome, but not in the same year.'

A more particular history of St. Cyprian may be collected from his life, written by his deacon Pontius, from his own works, the mention made of him by other ecclesiastical writers, and those Acts of his martyrdom, which are generally reckoned genuine, and are allowed by^b Basnage to contain for the most part matters of fact truly related, though he thinks they have some interpolations. It is fit I should here give a short history of this celebrated bishop of the third century.

Beside the name of Cyprian, he had that of^c Thascius; and

^a Cyprianus Afer, primum gloriose rhetoricam docuit: exinde suadente presbytero Cæcilio, a quo et cognomen sortitus est, Christianus factus, omnem substantiam suam pauperibus erogavit; ac post non multum temporis electus in presbyterum, etiam episcopus Carthaginensis constitutus est. Huius ingenii superfluum est indicem texere, cum sola clariora sint ejus opera. Passus est sub Valeriano et Gallieno

principibus, persecutione octava, eodem die quo Romæ Cornelius, sed non eodem anno. De V. I. cap. 67. ^b Non enim legitima omnino sunt atque sincera, quæ cum Cypriani operibus edita sunt ex Vet. Cod. MS. Et si multa in illis verissima contineri, faciles largiamur. Annal. Polit. Ecc. 257. num. 5. ^c Cyprianus qui et Thascius. . . Pupieno S. Ep. Cyprian. 66. [al. 69.] Vid. et Passionis Act. p. 13.

bore likewise, as we have already seen, the name of Cæcilius, from the presbyter by whom he was converted. His whole name therefore was Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus. He was an African, as we have been assured by Jerom; but that he was born at Carthage is not certain. His conversion happened, according to ^d bishop Pearson, in the year 246: and therefore, since he suffered martyrdom in the year 258, the greatest part of his life was spent in heathenism, and he might be born before the end of the second century. Cæcilius ^e was not only a presbyter by office, in the church of Carthage, but venerable likewise for his age, at the time of Cyprian's conversion.

Jerom says, that Cyprian, in the former part of his life, taught rhetoric with great applause. Lactantius ^f writes to the same purpose; and the like occurs ^g in Eusebius's Chronicle. Fabricius, ^h however, was of opinion, that Cyprian rather shewed his eloquence at the bar, than taught it in the schools; which, he thinks, may be concluded from what Cyprian ⁱ himself has intimated of his having lived in great plenty and splendour: but the words which that learned writer refers to, need not ^k to be understood as a description of Cyprian's own circumstances. Undoubtedly Cyprian had a good estate, which he sold, and gave to the poor, soon after his conversion, as Jerom informs us; and still more particularly ^l Pontius, who mentions this as one of the extraordinary actions of Cyprian before baptism, whilst he was yet a catechumen: but Jerom, who was not ignorant, as it seems, of our bishop's circumstances, and has often mentioned him in his works, and ^m had a great opinion of his eloquence, never gives him the title or character of a pleader, or a magistrate; and in one ⁿ place, beside that already quoted from his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, expressly says, that Cyprian

^d Vid. Ann. Cypr. p. 6. ^e Erat sane illi etiam de nobis contubernium viri justitiae et laudibilis memorie Cæcilii, et ætate tunc et honore presbyteri, qui eum ad agnitionem veræ divinitatis a seculari errore correxerat. Cypr. Vit. per Pont. pag. 3.

^f Cyprianus magnam sibi gloriam ex artis oratorie professione quaesierat. Lact. Div. Inst. Lib. v. cap. 1. ^g Cyprianus primum rhetor, deinde presbyter, ad extremum Carthaginensis episcopus martyrio coronatur. Eus. Chr. p. 175.

^h Non rhetoricam adeo in scholis docuisse, quam in foro exercuisse Cyprianus videtur. Confer quæ ipse de se Cyprianus libro ad Donatum, non longe ab initio. Fabric. annot. ad Hieron. de V. I. c. 67.

ⁱ ad Donat. p. 2 et 3. Oxon. 1682.

^k Vid. Vit. S. Cyprian. a Benedictino adornat. num. 1. p. 39. Paris. 1726.

^l Nondum secunda nativitas novum hominem splendore toto divinæ lucis oculaverat. . . . Distractis rebus suis ad indigentiam pauperum sustentandam tota prædialia pretio dispensans, . . . &c. Pont. p. 2. Oxon.

^m Beatus Cyprianus instar fontis purissimi, dulcis incedit et placidus. Hieron. Ep. 49. al. 13. ad Paulinum. p. 567. m. Ed. Bened. Cyprianus vir eloquentia pollens et martyrio. Id. ad Magn. Ep. 83. p. 655.

ⁿ Proponamus nobis beatum Cyprianum, qui prius idololatriæ assertor fuit, et in tantam gloriam venit eloquentiæ, ut oratoriam quoque doceret Carthagin. Id. Comm. in Jonæ cap. 3.

taught rhetoric at Carthage. Not to add, that what he said of Cyprian to the same purpose ^o in the Chronicle ought to be reckoned Jerom's rather than Eusebius's. And that Cyprian taught rhetoric in the schools is plainly said ^r by St. Augustine, who must be reckoned a material evidence. But I do not perceive him, or any one else to say, that Cyprian ever pleaded, or exercised the office of a magistrate. And in that way he might come to have a good estate, and be greatly respected. The profession of rhetoric could not but be very profitable ^s at that time, especially if the professor himself was a man of ability in his way, as Cyprian was. Possibly Cyprian had a stated salary: if not, the gratuities of his numerous scholars could not but be very considerable. His reputation being great, all the youth in general in those parts, who were of any fortune, or who aimed to be magistrates and judges, or pleaders, would come to his school. Besides, Cyprian was not only master of the theory of his art, but of the practical part likewise. He not only understood the rules of rhetoric, and how to teach others eloquence, but he was also eloquent himself; and very probably composed for others arguments, or pleadings, or harangues, or panegyrics, and such like discourses, for ^t which he would be well recompensed: and in these two things, teaching persons rhetoric, or qualifying them for the bar, and perhaps sometimes composing pleadings for his scholars, or others, I take to be comprehended the full meaning and intention of St. Augustine's ^s words, where he speaks of Cyprian's promoting or improving forensic disputes and contentions.

Cyprian had a quick advancement to the highest offices in the church. This is intimated by Jerom, and more particularly related by ^t Pontius. Bishop Pearson ^u computes, that he was

* See before, note ^g. ^p Inter quos et Cyprianus. . . . Qui enim in ludo perverſitatis humanæ et ſuam et aliorum linguas docuerat loqui mendacium, ut quod ab adverſario objiceretur, aſtuta fallacia negaretur, iam in alia ſchola didicerat conſtitendo devitare adverſarium. Auguſt. Serm. 312. Tom. v. Bened. [Al de diverſis 116.]
^q Quid ſi etiam figuras locutionis quæ illa arte traduntur, in iis ſaltem quæ de Apoſtoli eloquio commemoravi, oſtendere voluiſſem; . . . Hæc omnia, quando a magiſtris docentur, pro magno habentur, magno emuntur pretio, magna jactatione venduntur. Aug. de Doct. Chriſt. l. iv. cap. 7. n. 14. T. iii. P. i. ^r Nunc probabo quas tu ab ore noſtro laudes Cyprianæ deſideres. Certe ſi adhuc in ſchola

rhetorum verba diſcipulis venderem, prius ab eis mercedem ſumerem. Vendere tibi volo laudem pudiciſſimæ conjugis tuæ; prius mihi mercedem da, pudicitiam tuam. Aug. Ep. 259. n. 4. al. 125. ^s Et ut tantæ vocis tuba, quæ forenſium mendaciorum certamina ſolebat acuere, ad proſternendum pretioſis ſanctorum mortibus diabolum Chriſto militantes et in ipſo gloriantes devotos martyres excitaret. Auguſt. Serm. 312. al. de diverſis 116. ^t Prefbyterium et Sacerdotium ſtatim accepit. Pont. p. 2. Judicio Dei et plebis favore ad officium ſacerdotii et epiſcopatus gradum adhuc neophytus, et, ut putabatur, novellus, electus eſt. Id. p. 3. ^u Pearson. Ann. Cypr. p. 8. 9.

made presbyter in 247, and bishop of Carthage near the end of the year 248. The learned Benedictine, who writes the life of St. Cyprian prefixed to Stephen Baluze's edition of this father, thinks, that ^w he might be baptised in the year 244 or 245, and made bishop in 248 or 249, supposing it to be scarce possible to determine exactly and with certainty the year of either of those events. Pagi likewise thought it to be doubtful, whether ^x Cyprian was advanced to the episcopate in the year 248 or 249.

Cyprian ^y was made bishop against his own inclination, at the general and earnest desire of the people of Carthage. But his election ^z was opposed by several presbyters of that church, five in number, who ^a afterwards gave him a great deal of uneasiness. It is no where expressly said who was his immediate predecessor; but ^b it is, probably, concluded by learned men, that his name was Donatus.

The beginning of St. Cyprian's episcopate was peaceable, under the emperor Philip; but ^c near the end of the year 249, or early in the year 250, began the Decian persecution. This bishop of Carthage was extremely obnoxious to the heathen people; and they often demanded in a clamorous manner, in the theatre, and other public places, that he should be thrown to the lions, as is related by ^d Pontius, and ^e by Cyprian himself. Hereupon he retired, (as Pearson supposeth ^f in Jan. 250) judging it to be ^g for the good of his people, and agreeable to the doctrine of Christ in the gospel, and ^h having also received a divine direction to that purpose. The government not being able to find him out, he was ⁱ proscribed, and proclamation was made at Carthage, That if any one had any goods of Cæcilius Cyprian,

^w Vit. S. Cypr. (ut supra) § ii. p. 42. et § iv. p. 45. fin. ^x Vid. Pagi Crit. 248.

n. 2. ^y Non præteribo etiam illud eximium, quem admodum cum in dilectionem ejus et honorem totus populus adspirante domino proflicet, humiliter ille secessit, antiquioribus cedens, et indignum se titulo tanti honoris existimans, ut dignus magis fieret. Pont. p. 3. ^z Quidam illi resisterunt, etiam ut vinceret. Pont. p. 3. Vid. etiam Cypr. Ep. 43. al. 40. ^a Vid. Pear. Ann. Cypr. 251. n. 3. ^b Vid. Pearf. Ann. Cypr. 248. n. 3. et Benedic. Vit. St. Cypr. n. 4. p. 45. ^c Vid. Pagi Crit. 250. n. 4. ^d ... maxime cum et furragiis sepe repetitis ad leonem postularetur. Pont. p. 4. ^e Nec me in conspectum publicum, et maxime ejus loci, ubi toties flagitatus et quaesitus fuisssem, temere committere. Cypr. Ep. 14. [al. 6.]

p. 31. Orto statim turbationis impetu primo, cum me clamore violento frequenter populus flagitasset, non tam meam salutem, quam quietem fratrum publicam cogitans, interim secessi. Ep. 20. [al. 15.] p. 42. Vid. et Ep. 59. [al. 55.] p. 130.

^f Ann. Cyp. p. 17. n. 2. Conf. Pagi 250. n. 5. ^g See note ^e. ^h Et audietis omnia, quando ad vos reducem me dominus fecerit, qui ut secederem iussit. Ep. 16. [al. 10.] p. 38. Credidit se, nisi domino latebram tunc jubenti parvisset, etiam ipsa passione peccare. Pont. p. 5. in.

ⁱ Statim denique pro talibus meritis etiam proscriptionis gloriam consecutus est. Pont. p. 4. Persecutio enim veniens. ... me proscriptionis onere depressit, cum publice legeretur: si quis tenet vel possidet de bonis Cæcili Cypriani episcopi Christianorum. Ep. 66. [al. 69.] p. 166.

bishop

bishop of the Christians, he should discover them. Nor is the place where he absconded known to this day. In this retirement, which lasted about fourteen months, he was not idle, nor unprofitable, as appears from the many epistles written by him during that time, a large part of which are still extant. Cyprian seems to have taken with him from Carthage one of his deacons, named Victor, and some other friends. It is plain, he^k had such company with him at the beginning of his retirement. They may be supposed to have been of great use to him in taking copies of his letters sent to Carthage, and other places: and to their diligent and faithful attendance on their bishop, as well as perhaps to the kind assistance likewise of some others, who came to him afterwards, we ought to reckon ourselves indebted for the letters above-mentioned, now in our hands.

The heat of the persecution being abated, in the year 251, soon^l after Easter, Cyprian came out of the place of his retirement, and returned to Carthage. In the^m month of May, in the same year, he held a council for regulating some affairs of the church, particularly the treatment of such as had lapsed in the persecution: and in the year followingⁿ a second council, in which the same affair was farther considered and regulated. There were, beside these, several other councils held at Carthage in the time of this bishop of that city; three of which were engaged about the question of the baptism of heretics, in which Cyprian differed from Stephen bishop of Rome, and some others. Cyprian was of opinion, that^{**} all baptism out of the catholic church was null and void, and that they who had received such baptism only ought to be baptised when they came over from heretics to the church. What was Stephen's opinion is^o disputed; whether he held that baptism by all sorts of heretics was valid, and that they who came from them needed not to be baptised; or, whether he maintained the validity of that baptism only which was performed in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The most remarkable of these three coun-

^k Salutant vos Victor diaconus, et qui cum sunt. Ep. 5.

^l Vid. Ann.

Cypr. p. 48. n. 3.

^m Ann. Cypr. ib.

n. 5. Conf. Pagi 251. n. 17, 18. 21.

ⁿ Ann. Cypr. p. 35. n. 6. 7. Vid. etiam Cypr. Ep. 59. al. 55. et Conf. Pagi 252.

^{**} . . . visum est ei cum ferme octoginta coepiscopis suis Africanarum ecclesiarum, omnem hominem, qui extra ecclesie catholice communionem baptizatus fuisset, oportere ad ecclesiam venientem de novo baptizari. Auguſt. de Bap. contr.

Donat. l. i. cap. 18. p. 93, 94. T. ix. Bened. Ecce in unitate video Cyprianum et alios collegas eius, qui facto concilio censuerunt omnes, qui extra ecclesie communionem fuerint baptizati, baptismum non habere; et ideo eis dandum esse, cum veniunt. ib. l. ii. c. 6. p. 100. D. Conf. Cypr. ad Jub. Ep. 73. et Conc. Carth.

^o Vid. Tillemont Mem. Ecc. T. iv. St. Cyprien art. 42, et note xxxix. Du Pin Bibl. St. Cyprien Basn. Ann. 256. n. 3, 4. Pagi Crit. in Bar. 256. n. 4, 5, 6.

cils was the last, at which were (A) present eighty-five or eighty-seven bishops, beside presbyters and others. It was held in 256, and the acts of it are still in being. Of these councils I give no farther account, that I may have the more room to shew the excellent conduct of Cyprian in some other matters, which deserve particular notice in this place.

About this time a pestilential distemper wasted the Roman empire, raging in some part of it for several years. Some learned men think it begun in the reign of Decius, and increased very much under Gallus, about the year 252, in whose time it is placed by ^p Eusebius in his Chronicle, and ^q by Eutropius, and by ^r several other ancient writers. Pagi ^s is of opinion, that this pestilence afflicted the Roman empire fifteen years, beginning under Gallus and Volusian, in the year 252, and ceasing in 267. In this affliction Carthage had its share; and upon that occasion Cyprian was not negligent in the duties of his episcopal function. His deacon Pontius informs us, that ^t he called together his people, and discoursed to them of the obligation of compassion, shewing, out of the divine scriptures, how acceptable offices of kindness are unto God; adding, that it would be no extraordinary thing, if we should take care of our own people: *He only is perfect, who does more than publicans and heathens*; Matt. v. 45, 46. We are to propose to ourselves, said Cyprian, the imitation of our heavenly Father, who causeth his sun to rise, and sendeth rain upon all men; and thereby to shew, that we are not unworthy of our high birth. This discourse had a good effect; and in the time of that calamity there were the most generous acts of goodness performed by the Christians at Carthage, as ^u Pontius relates, and I sometime may have an opportunity to shew more at large. Upon this occasion, likewise, Cyprian wrote a treatise entitled, Of Mortality, or of the Plague; and, as is ^w computed, in the year 252.

(A) There were present eighty-five bishops, one of which had two proxies, who at the same time he voted himself gave in also the votes of two absent bishops, according to the power they had given him. The number of votes therefore was in all eighty-seven. ^p Sub hoc [Gallo] pestilens morbus multas totius orbis provincias occupavit, maximeque Alexandriam et Ægyptum, ut scribit Dionysius, et Cypriani de mortalitate testis est liber. Euseb. Chron. p. 47. ^q Sola pestilentia et morbis atque ægitudinibus notus eorum [Galli et Volusiani] principatus fuit. Eutr. ^r Vid. Pagi Crit. 252. n. 25. ^s Vid. Pagi ib. 252. n. 24. et seqq. 265. n. 5.

^t Aggregatam primo in loco uno plebem de misericordiæ bonis instituit, docens divinæ lectionis exemplis, quantum ad promerendum Deum prosint officia pietatis. Tunc deinde subjungit, non esse mirabile, si nostros tantum debito caritatis obsequio faveremus; eum perfectum posse fieri qui plus aliquid publicano vel ethnico fecerit. . . . Et qui se Dei filium profitetur, cur non exemplum patris imitatur? Respondere, inquit, nos decet natalibus nostris, et quos renatos per Deum constat, degeneres esse non congruit. Pont. p. 5. ^u Id. p. 6. ^w Vid. Pearson. Ann. Cypr. p. 39. n. 37. et Basn. 258. n. 14.

There

There was another occasion, in which the virtue of Cyprian and the people under his care was very conspicuous. Some barbarous people of Africa made inroads into Numidia, and carried off with them captives a great number of Christians. The bishops of Numidia gave Cyprian notice of that disaster. Hereupon he made a collection at Carthage for the redemption of those who had been carried captive; and ² the whole sum contributed by Cyprian himself and his people, and some (B) bishops and other Christians then at Carthage, amounted to about seven hundred and eighty pounds; which Cyprian sent to the bishops of the province of Numidia, together with his own and his people's prayers, that no such like disaster might befall them again; at the same time assuring them that, if there should, the Christians with him would be always ready to send relief to their brethren.

But the most glorious scene of Cyprian's life remains. The emperor Valerian, who for some time had been very favourable to the Christians, became their persecutor. Cyprian, having been brought before the proconsul, made a confession of the Christian faith, and was banished to Curubis. So far we are informed by ¹ Pontius, who ² refers to the Acts for particulars; and by the Acts which we now have, we are informed that, ³ on the 30th day of August 257, Cyprian was brought before the proconsul Aspasius Paternus; and, being examined by him, owned himself to be a Christian, and a bishop; declaring, that he knew no other gods, beside the one true God, who made the heaven,

¹ Misimus autem sestertia centum milia nummorum, . . . Et optamus quidem nihil tale de cætero fieri, . . . Si tamen ad explorandam nostri animi caritatem, et examinandam nostri pectoris fidem, tale aliquid acciderit, nolite cunctari nunciare hæc literis vestris; pro certo habentes, ecclesiam nostram et fraternitatem istic universam ne hæc ultra fiant precibus orare; si facta fuerint, libenter, et largiter subsidia præstare. Ep. 62. al. 60. (B) Mr. Marshall, in a note upon this epistle of St. Cyprian, p. 177, says, 'that sum was collected from his own church only, over and above the several sums contributed from such bishops as happened to be at Carthage when this case was laid before our author.' And so Fleury understood it; see his Ecclesiastical History, B. vii. ch. 14. p. 420. But Tillemont takes it, as I have done above, that the contributions of Cyprian's church, and of some bishops then at Carthage, all together amounted to that sum, Tout cela ensemble fit une

somme de vingt-cinq mille livres. Mem. Ec. St. Cypr. art. 37. p. 210. Which is rightest I am not much concerned to determine. The thing is of no great importance.

² His tam bonis et tam piis actibus supervenit exilium. Pont. p. 6. Ut imminentis martyrii pleniore fiducia, non exulem tantummodo Curubis, sed et martyrem possideret. ib. 7.

³ Et ut, quid sacerdos Dei Proconsule interrogante responderet, taceam; sunt Acta quæ referant. ib. p. 6.

⁴ Imperatore Valeriano quartum et Gallieno tertium Consulibus, tertio Calendarum Septembrium, Carthagine in secretario Paternus Proconsul Cypriano dixit: . . . Exquisivi ergo de nomine tuo? quid mihi respondes? Cyprianus episcopus dixit: Christianus sum, et Episcopus. Nullos alios Deos novi, nisi unum et verum Deum, qui fecit celum et terram, mare, et quæ in eis sunt omnia. . . . Poteris ergo secundum præceptum Valeriani et Gallieni exul ad urbem Cucubitanam proficisci. Cypr. Pass. p. 11.

and

and the earth, the sea, and all things therein. Being stedfast in this profession, the proconsul banished him to Curubis. His deacon, ^b Pontius, accompanied him to the place of his exile, where he arrived the 13th or 14th of September. Cyprian had many fellow sufferers. Great numbers of Christians in the province of Numidia were apprehended, and sent to the mines. We have ^c a letter of Cyprian, written in his exile, which is inscribed to nine bishops by name, and beside them to others, presbyters, deacons, and the rest of the brethren in the mines, martyrs of God the Father Almighty, and Jesus Christ our Lord. And those confessors, who were not all in one and the same place, but in mines at some distance from each other, answer him again in three several letters, which are still extant in St. Cyprian's works.

Whilst ^d Cyprian continued at Curubis, Galerius Maximus succeeded Paternus as proconsul of Africa. He recalled Cyprian from his banishment, who then went to his gardens, or country house, near Carthage, by the orders, as it seems, of the proconsul. Those gardens had been sold by Cyprian, and the price of them given for the benefit of the poor, as was formerly observed: but, ^e by some favourable providence, they were again returned to the possession of our bishop.

Soon after his arrival there, Cyprian understood that there were orders given for bringing him before the proconsul, who was then at Utica, a city of Africa, about forty miles distant from Carthage; but, being desirous rather to die in the presence of his own people, he thought fit to go from his country seat, and conceal himself for a while. Of this he gives an account ^f in his last letter to his clergy and people. The proconsul being come from Utica to Carthage, Cyprian returned to his gardens, where many persons of the best rank in the city came to him, entreating him to retire, and offering him likewise a safe place

^b Nam et me inter domesticos comites dignatio caritatis ejus delegerat exilem voluntarium. Pont. p. 7. ^c Ep. 76. al. 77.

^d Cumque diu ibidem moraretur, successit Aspasio Paterno proconsuli Galerius Maximus, proconsul, qui sanctum Cyprianum episcopum ab exilio revocatum sibi jussit presentari. Cumque Cyprianus sanctus martyr electus a Deo, de civitate Curubiana, in qua exilio praecepto Aspasii Paterni tunc proconsulis datus fuerat, regressus esset, ex sacro praescripto in hortis suis manebat. Aët. Paiss. p. 12.

^e ad hortos, inquam, quos inter initia

fidei suae venditos, et Dei indulgentia restitutos, pro certo iterum in usus pauperum vendidisset, nisi invidiam de persecutione vitaret. Pont. p. 8. fin.

^f Cum perlatum ad nos fuisset, fratres carissimi, frumentarios esse missos, qui me Uticam perducerunt, et consilio carissimorum persuasum esset, ut de hortis nostris interim secederemus, iusta interveniente causa, consensimus; eo quod episcopum in ea civitate, in qua ecclesiae dominicae praestit, illic dominum confiteri, et plebem universam praepositi praesentis confessione clarificari. Cypr. Ep. 81. [al. 83.] init. p. 238.

of retreat: but he would by no means comply with those proposals. This is written ^s by his deacon Pontius.

On the 13th of September 258, an officer, with ^h soldiers, was sent to Cyprian's gardens by the proconsul, to bring him before him. Cyprian then knew his end was near; and with a ready and constant mind, and a cheerful countenance, he went without delay to Sexti, a place about six miles from Carthage, where ⁱ the proconsul was for the sake of his health. Cyprian's cause was deferred ^k for that day. He was therefore ordered to the house of an officer, where he was kept that night, but was well accommodated, and his friends had free access to him. The news of this having been brought to Carthage, a great number of people of all sorts, and the Christians in general, flocked thence to Sexti; and Cyprian's people lay all night before the door of the officer, thus ^l keeping, as Pontius expresses it, the vigil of their bishop's passion.

The next morning, the 14th of September, he was led to the proconsul's palace, surrounded ^m by a mixed multitude of people, and a strong guard of soldiers. 'After ⁿ some time the proconsul came out into the hall; and Cyprian being set before him, he said, "Art thou Thascius Cyprian?" Cyprian the bishop answered, "I am." Galerius Maximus the proconsul said, "The most sacred emperors have commanded thee to sacrifice." Cyprian the bishop answered, "I do not sacrifice." Galerius Maximus

^t Conveniebant interim plures egregii et clarissimi ordinis et sanguinis, sed et seculi nobilitate generosi: qui propter amicitiam eius antiquam, secessum subinde suaderent: et ne parum esset nuda suadela, etiam loca in quæ secederet offerebant. Ille vero jam mundum suspensa in cælum mente neglexerat, nec suadellis blandimentibus annuebat. Pont. p. 8. ^h Cum ecce Proconsulis jussu ad hortos ejus . . . cum militibus suis princeps repente subitavit. id. ibid. ⁱ . . . et in Sexti perduxerunt: ubi idem Galerius Maximus proconsul bonæ valetudinis recuperandæ gratia secesserat. Act. Pass. p. 12. ^k Sed dilatus in crastinum, ad domum principis a prætorio revertebatur. . . . Receptum eum tamen et in domo principis constitutum una nocte continuè custodia delicata: ita ut convivæ ejus, et cari in contubernio ex more fuerimus. Pont. p. 9. ^l Plebs interim tota sollicita, ne per noctem aliquid sine conscientia sui fieret, ante fores principis excubabat. Concessit ei divina tunc bonitas, vere digno, ut Dei populus etiam in sacerdotis pallione vigilaret. id. ib.

^m Egressus est domum principis, . . . et agminibus multitudinis mixtæ ex omni parte vallatus est. Sic autem comitatu ejus infinitus exercitus adhaerebat, quasi ad expugnandum mortem manu facta veniretur. ib. p. 9. ⁿ Cumque oblatus fuisset, Galerius Maximus proconsul Cypriano episcopo dixit: 'Tu es Thascius Cyprianus?' Cyprianus episcopus respondit, 'Ego.' Galerius Maximus dixit, 'Jusserunt te sacratissimi imperatores cæremoniari.' Cyprianus episcopus dixit, 'Non facio.' Galerius Maximus ait, 'Consule tibi.' Cyprianus episcopus respondit, 'Fac quod tibi præceptum est: in re tam justa nulla est consultatio.' Galerius Maximus collocutus cum consilio, sententiam vix ægre dixit verbis hujusmodi: 'Diu sacrilega mente vixisti, et plurimos nefariæ tibi conspirationis homines aggregasti. . . . Et his dictis, decretum ex tabella recitavit, 'Thascium Cyprianum gladio animadverti placet.' Cyprianus episcopus dixit, 'Deo gratias.' Act. Pass. p. 13.

said,

“said, “Bewell advised.” Cyprian the bishop answered, “Do as thou art commanded: in so just a cause there needs no consultation.” The proconsul having advised with his council, spoke to Cyprian in angry terms, as being an enemy to the gods, and a seducer of the people; and then read his sentence out of a tablet: “It is decreed, that Thascius Cyprian be beheaded.” Cyprian the bishop said, “God be thanked.” This is the account given in the Acts of St. Cyprian’s passion; and Pontius writes to the like purpose.

Cyprian^p was then led away to the field of Sexti, a large level spot of ground, encompassed with trees, the boughs of which were then loaded with spectators; and, in the presence of a great number of people, Cyprian was there beheaded, according to the sentence pronounced upon him.

Lactantius, who himself^r greatly commends the style of St. Cyprian’s works, says they were despised by the learned heathens that had looked into them: and informs us, that^s he had heard a person, a man of considerable eloquence, altering one of the letters of his name, call him Coprian; thereby intimating, that when he was a man of good parts, and qualified for great things, he had followed silly fables. But it seems to me reasonable to suppose, that Cyprian, who was a man of bright natural parts, and no inconsiderable acquired abilities, had well informed himself, and had received some good evidence of those principles, for the sake of which he abandoned a reputable and profitable employment, if not an honourable and plentiful station, without any worldly prospects whatever; and in the service of which he spent ten years, during his episcopate, in great labour and much opposition, and at length cheerfully resigned his life, as a confirmation of the truth of them, and as an example of constance, by which his people, persons whom he tenderly loved, might be induced to suffer any thing rather than deny them. The whole

^p Pont. p. 9. f. 10. init. ^r Et ita idem Cyprianus in agrum Sexti productus est. Act. Pass. p. 13. ^s Iple autem locus æqualis est ubi pati contigit, ut arboribus ex omni parte densatis sublimis spectaculum præbeat. Sed per enormitatem spatii longioris visu denegato per confusam nimis turbam, personæ faventes in ramos arborum reperant. Pont. p. 10. ^t Unus igitur præcipuus, et clarus extitit Cyprianus, quoniam et magnam sibi gloriam ex artis oratoris professione quæsierat. . . . Erat enim ingenio facili, copioso, suavi, et (quæ ser-

monis maxima est virtus) aperto; ut discernere nequeas, utrumne ornatior in eloquendo, an facilius in explicando, an potentior in persuadendo fuerit. Lact. Divin. Inst. lib. v. cap. 1. sub. hñ.

^u Hic tamen placere ultra verba, sacramentum ignorantibus non potest. . . . Denique a doctis hujus sæculi, quibus forte ejus scripta innotuerunt, derideri solet. Audivi ego quendam hominem sane disertum, qui eum immutata una litera Coprianum vocaret; quasi quod elegans ingenium, et melioribus rebus aptum, ad aniles fabulas contulisset. ib.

p. 760.

tenor of Cyprian's life after his conversion, peaceable, charitable, and beneficial to men of all characters in distress; the manner of his death, undaunted, willing, and ready, without seeking it, are a very valuable testimony in behalf of the truth and excellence of the principles of the Christian religion.

I have no design to draw at length Cyprian's character. What has been said just now may suffice. However, I cannot forbear observing, in the words of (c) Mr. Marshall, for giving my readers some farther idea of our author, that he was the bishop of a most flourishing church, the metropolis of a province; that he was a man made for business, had a diligent and active spirit, and talents equal to the charge wherewith he was entrusted; and I would add, that he was not only a man of great authority in his life-time, but likewise of great reputation afterwards. This has appeared in part from what has been taken from Jerom and Lactantius. They who are desirous of knowing more of the praises that have been given Cyprian by ancient writers, may consult [†] Ruinart and [†] Tillemont. I shall observe only a few things from St. Augustine. In his time the day of St. Cyprian's martyrdom was a festival not only at Carthage, but in other places of Africa, as appears from ^w five sermons of Augustine, still extant, delivered by him on that day at Hippo. It may be concluded from [†] what he says, as well as from some other ancient writers, that the anniversary of Cyprian's martyrdom was then observed also in other parts out of Africa. Augustine ^y calls Cyprian a most agreeable writer, as well as a blessed martyr. He assures us, that [†] Cyprian was then generally well known in the world, partly for the constancy and fortitude of his sufferings, partly for the charms of his most agreeable writings. A remark of Augustine [†] upon the difference of style in Cyprian's works may

(c) See Mr. Marshall's preface, p. 14.

[†] Admonit. in Vit. et Act. S. Cyprian.

ap. Act. Mart. Sin. et Sel. p. 198, 199.

[†] Tillem. St. Cyprien. art. 62, 63, 64.

^w Sermon. 309. . . . 313. T. v. Bened.

^y Quis enim hodie, non dicam in hac

nostra civitate, sed plane per Africam

totam, transmarinasque regiones, non

Christianus solum, sed Paganus aut Ju-

dæus, aut etiam Hæreticus, possit inve-

niri, qui non nobiscum dicat Natalem

Martyris Cypriani? Aug. Sermon. 310. al.

de Diversis, 113. in. ^y Nonne adspi-

cimus, quanto auro et argento et veste

suffarcinatus exierit de Ægypto Cypri-

anus doctor suavissimus et martyr beatif-

simus? quanto Lactantius, &c. Aug. de

Doctr. Chr. lib. ii. cap. 40. n. 61.

[†] Verum quia non solum dixit quæ audirentur, sed scripsit etiam quæ legere-
rentur; . . . et innotuit regionibus mul-
tis, partim per famam fortissimæ passio-
nis, partim per dulcedinem suavissimæ
lectionis. Sermon. 310. sub. fin.

[†] Est tale aliquid in epistola beatissimi

Cypriani. . . . Ait ergo quodam in loco:

[†] Petamus hanc sedem: dant secretum

[†] vicina secreta: ubi dum erratici pal-

[†] mitum lapsus pendulis nexibus per a-

[†] rundines bajulas repunt, viteam porti-

[†] cum frondea testâ fecerunt. Non di-

cuntur ista nisi mirabiliter affluentissima

secunditate facundie, sed profusione ni-

mia gravitati displicent. Qui vero hæc

amant, profecto eos qui non ita dicunt,

sed calligatius eloquuntur, non posse ita

be esteemed a proof both of his own judgment, and of the judgment and abilities of our author in that way.

As my history of St. Cyprian is but short, I would refer my readers to ^b Cave, and others, who have written his life more at large; and particularly to ^c Le Clerc, who has done the same, in the free way. I should have been well pleased to insist upon Cyprian's visions and revelations; but it would require more room than I can spare here: besides, though I have sometimes taken notice of such things, as in the histories of Gregory of Neocæsarea, and Dionysius of Alexandria, and perhaps occasionally in some other chapters, that I might not leave this matter altogether untouched; there is another place in this work, where it may be proper to observe distinctly the continuance of miraculous powers, or extraordinary gifts of the spirit, in the church, after the time of the apostles; and for that place I reserve the farther consideration of Cyprian's claims to a share in such gifts.

II. St. Cyprian's works are distributed into two parts; Tracts, or Treatises; and Epistles. The tracts are upon a variety of subjects. Some are defences of the Christian religion against Jews and Gentiles, some upon Christian morality, others concerning the discipline of the church. His epistles were written partly in the time of his retirement under the Decian persecution, partly afterwards. With them are joined divers epistles of others sent to him; they are very useful and entertaining; I need not give a more particular account of * * * them. However, it may not be amiss to observe, that St. Jerom ^d does not reckon Cyprian to have written any commentaries upon scripture; though in a chain upon St. Luke's gospel, mentioned by ^e Montfaucon, Cyprian is said to be one of the ancient writers, from whom those interpretations are taken. James le Long ^{ee} has put Cyprian among the commentators upon scripture; but it is only for the sake of his treatise on the Lord's Prayer.

eloqui existimant, non judicio illa evitare. Quapropter ille vir sanctus et posse se ostendit sic dicere, et nolle, quoniam postmodum nunquam. Aug. De Doctr. Chr. lib. iv. cap. 13. n. 31.

^b Cav. Hist. Lit. and Lives of the Primitive Fathers. Tillemont Mem. T. iv. Part i. Du Pin Bibl. Rainart. Act. Mart. Sinc. et Sel. Vit. S. Cypr. a benedictino adornat. Basnag. Annal. Pagi Crit. Pearson Ann. Cypr. Dodwell. Diff. Cypr. ^c Bibl. Univ. T. xii. p. 207, &c.

* * * It is said there are some letters of St. Cyprian at Venice, which have not been yet printed. Vid. Montfaucon, Diar. Ital. cap. 5. p. 75.

^d Beatus Cyprianus inlita fontis purissimi, dulcis incedit et placidus; et quum totus sit in exhortatione virtutum, occupatus persecutionum angustiis, de scripturis divinis nequaquam disseruit. Hieron. ad Paulin. Ep. 49. [al. 73.] p. 367. m. ^e Vid. Bibl. Coislin. p. 251. ^{ee} Vid. Le Long Bibl. Sa. T. ii. p. 693. Paris. 1723.

Though

Though I give no account of the several editions of St. Cyprian's works, I may be allowed to observe here, that (D) we have a beautiful edition of them in English, with useful and valuable notes, by the late Mr. Nathaniel Marshall, published in the year 1717.

Some pieces have been ascribed to St. Cyprian which are not his; but learned men are now so generally agreed what are his genuine works, what not, that I need not enlarge upon that point. As several of those tracts which formerly had been reckoned his, and some others, are still usually bound up together with his works, and are useful, and written by good hands, I shall make some extracts out of them in a chapter apart, and there give a short history or account of each of them.

All St. Cyprian's works, both tracts and epistles, abound with texts of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. But there is one tract, entitled Testimonies against the Jews, to Quirinus, in three books; which tract is little more than a collection of texts of scripture under several heads; for there is nothing in it properly Cyprian's, beside two short prefaces, and those several heads, or the titles of the chapters of the work, and the names of the books of scripture, from which he takes his testimonies. The genuineness of this tract has been called

(D) I have made but little use of Mr. Marshall's translation. All my passages out of St. Cyprian, except perhaps two or three, or four at most, were collected, translated, and put in the order they are now in, before I was acquainted with it. However, I have made some improvements by Mr. Marshall's performance, and have now taken care to make several references to him, which I hope the attentive reader will perceive. As I have not read over Mr. Marshall's translation, my testimony can be of no great value. But so far as I have had leisure and opportunity to read and examine it, it appears to be, together with the notes, a work of much labour and study, and to deserve great commendation. Nevertheless there is a particular or two, which I must remark. Mr. Marshall, in his preface, p. 17, 18, expresseth himself in these very words. 'I know not whether it be worth while to take notice of one particular liberty which I have taken, of prefixing the title of saint to the several apostles and evangelists, as they occur in our author, though he himself has named them simply and plain-

ly, without any such appellation.' And afterwards he says: 'I have here and there also expressed my author's sense in the language of holy scripture, where he himself did not mean to quote it. But then, in such cases, I never refer to the passage in the margin, as I always do where he particularly cites any verse or chapter of the inspired writers.' But it appears to me, that both these are unwarrantable and unjustifiable liberties, not proper to be taken in translating ancient authors. With regard to the first, though of no very great importance; it seems to me to be rather better to shew primitive writers in their own original simplicity and plainness, as near as possible. With regard to the other liberty, which Mr. Marshall says he has taken, it appears to me altogether unjustifiable. Ordinary readers will be liable to be misled by that method: and I believe it must be attended with some bad consequences, which good Mr. Marshall was not aware of. Perhaps this remark will be illustrated and confirmed by somewhat to be taken notice of by and by, at numb. 6.

in question by some, particularly by ^f Rivet. Here books of scripture are expressly quoted by name, which is seldom done in Cyprian's other works. Here also texts of scripture are cited, according to different readings from those found in his other writings. Nevertheless, it is ^g generally thought by learned men, that these objections are of no great moment, this tract having been quoted as St. Cyprian's by several ancient writers. Bishop Pearson ^h placeth these books in the year 248. The learned Benedictine ⁱ before mentioned supposeth likewise that they were written whilst Cyprian was presbyter, or soon after he was made bishop; and he offers some arguments that deserve consideration. Bishop Fell thinks this one of the first of St. Cyprian's tracts; and upon the ground of this opinion, concerning the early date of this work, is founded a solution of ^k the difficulty taken from the different citations of scripture, in this and other writings of this father. Mr. Simon, who dislikes Fell's solution, gives ^l another; but whether it be better than the bishop's I cannot say. Basnage, who ^m makes no doubt of the genuineness of this tract, and even thinks Pontius has referred to it, supposeth it written when Cyprian was bishop, and after the Decian persecution. Stephen Baluze maintains the genuineness of this work; but then at the same time he allows that it has been much interpolated. The words of one, who was well furnished with manuscripts of St. Cyprian's works, are so remarkable to this purpose, that the reader may expect to see them in the ⁿ margin.

^f Si tamen libri illi [ad Quirinum] sunt Cypriani omnes. Aliquos enim ad Quirinum scripsisse, ex Hieronymo, et aliis, qui eorum mentionem faciunt, probavit Pamelius. Sed an sint ii ipsi libri, quos habemus, dubium reddunt citationes librorum, quas his formulis enuntiat, præter Cypriani in aliis opusculis morem, κατὰ Lucam, κατὰ Marcum, &c. Rivet. Crit. Sacr. l. ii. cap. 15. p. 1097. ^g Vid. Notas Ed. Oxon. p. 17. Du Pin. Bibl. Tillemont. Tom. iv. St. Cyprien. art. 64. et note 54. ^h Ann. Cypr. p. 9. num. 1. ⁱ Vit. S. Cyprian. p. 44. num. 4. ^k . . . varietatis istius. . . . vix alia ratio reddi poterit, quam quod diversis temporibus scriberentur; et proinde dicendum tractatum hunc reliqua omnia quæ sequuntur prævertisse. Edit. Ox. in not. p. 17. ^l Il [l'Evêque d'Oxford] n'a pas pris garde, que cette ancienne traduction, qui étoit entre les mains du peuple, et qu'on lisoit dans les églises, n'empêchoit point ceux qui savoient la

langue Grecque de traduire le Grec des Septante, et celui du Nouveau Testament, à leur manière, quand ils le jugeoient à propos. C'est principalement à cela qu'on doit attribuer cette diversité de version des mêmes passages, qui est dans les différens livres de ce savant Eveque. R. Simon Critique des Comm. du N. T. chap. i. p. 15.

^m Ni a vero aberret conjectura, non ex titulo, quo Quirinus afficitur, sed ex verbis Pontii, librum ab episcopo Cypriano, sed extincta Decii persecutione, confectum fuisse censemus: "Quis emolumentam gratiæ proficientis ostenderit?" quibus innuit libros ad Quirinum, quorum ad præfationem digitem Pontius intendisse videtur. Basn. An. 258. num. 14.

ⁿ Si qua sunt loca in operibus sancti Cypriani, de quibus pronuntiari non possit ea certe illius esse, id vero in primis asseri potest de libris Testimoniorum ad Quirinum. Plures enim codices plus habent quam vulgatæ editiones, alii minus. Itaque, quoniam impossibile est discernere

And

And hence, if I mistake not, arises the truest and best solution of the difficulty before mentioned. Bishop Fell thought the different method of citing scriptures, and the different readings of texts, or passages, in this and the other works of Cyprian, to be owing to the distance of the times of writing them. This was one of Cyprian's first pieces; the rest was written at different times afterwards.

Simon says, that though there was at that time a Latin version generally used by Latin Christians, yet it was not uncommon for those who had learning, and understood Greek, to translate for themselves from the original, when they saw fit. And to this principally, says he, we ought to ascribe that diversity of translation of the same passages, which is found in the different books of this learned bishop. Nor is it impossible but this method may have been used by some learned men at that time; Cyprian in particular. Massuet^o indeed is pleased to make a doubt whether Cyprian understood Greek; but I think he is singular herein: others have a better opinion of our bishop's learning; for it has been generally supposed, that Firmilian's letter, written in Greek, was translated into Latin by him. I formerly referred (E) to several learned men of this sentiment. To them I would now add P the learned Benedictine, author of St. Cyprian's Life: and it appears to me highly probable, that Cyprian, who in the former part of his life professed rhetoric with reputation in the city of Carthage, was not unskilled in the Greek tongue. And in his remaining writings we find mention of some Greek authors, particularly ^a Plato, and Hermes Trismegistus, ^r Hippocrates, and Soranus: and he mentions them as if he was acquainted with their works, especially those of the two former.

But yet it seems to me that the forementioned reasons are not

ea quæ vere Cypriani sunt ab iis quæ post illum a studiosis addita sunt, nos retinui-
mus ea quæ reperta nobis sunt in antiquis
exemplaribus manuscriptis. Porro duo
tantum priores libri extant in editione
Sprensi, in veteri Veneta, et in ea quam
Remboldus procuravit. Erasinus tertiam
emissit ex codice scripto monasterii Gem-
blacensis. . . . Habui autem unum et vi-
ginti exemplaria vetera horum librorum,
quorum tamen quinque habent tantum
libros duos priores. Baluz. Not. ad Cy-
prian. p. 596. ^o Cyprianum autem
Græce doctum fuisse, nullo argumento
constat. Massuet. Diss. in Irenæ. ii. n.
54. p. 102.

note ^s. P Hæc autem Firmiliani episto-
la, quæ Latine reddita existat inter Cypri-
anicas septuagesima quinta, sic Cypriani-
cum stilum redolet, ut non alium inter-
pretem habuisse videatur. Vit. S. Cypr. n.
31. p. 118. init. ^q In quo et Plato
pari ratione consentit; et unum Deum
servans, cæteros angelos, vel dæmonas di-
cit. Hermes quoque Trismegistus unum
Deum loquitur, eumque incomprehensibi-
lem atque inestimabilem confitetur. De
Idol. Van. p. 14. ^r Non invenio unde
hoc nomen assumant; nisi forte qui plura
et secretiora legerunt apud Hippocratem
et Soranum κληρικὸς istos deprehenderunt.
Ep. 69. al. 76. p. 186.

(E) See Vol. ii. ch. 39.

sufficient to account for the diversity we are speaking of: I rather think it to be chiefly owing to the additions and alterations that have been made in the books of Testimonies. Such a collection of texts of scripture is very liable to be altered. It is likely that some texts have been added in latter ages, according to the version or readings then in use: and other passages, which were in the work from the beginning, have been altered according to the readings in use in the age of the copier or transcriber. The account which Stephen Baluze gives of the manuscripts of these books appears to me to put this out of question. Such additions and alterations may have been made without any bad intention, barely with a view of rendering the work more useful and more generally acceptable; though they who are curious would be better pleased to see these books genuine and uncorrupted in their original size, however small, just as they came out of Cyprian's hands. And as I think such books as these, consisting chiefly of collections of texts of scripture, are more especially liable to alteration, both by interpolation or addition, and by changing the original readings for such as afterwards were in use and were more modern; so I likewise question whether we can be sure, that in St. Cyprian's other works we always have the passages in the Latin version made use of by him, and as they came from him. I think bishop Fell speaks in the same manner: I put his words at the bottom of the ¹ page.

Upon the whole, there can be no doubt made but St. Cyprian published a work with this title; but it seems that the books of Testimonies which we now have, or at least some part of them, are liable to objections that have not been fully cleared up; for which reason it may be thought proper, that they should be quoted with some particular caution. Whenever therefore I take any thing out of the books of Testimonies, I intend to mention them expressly. There is another tract of St. Cyprian, which is written much in the same way with those books of Testimonies; it is entitled, An Exhortation to Martyrdom: but I do not know that such objections have been made against this as against the former.

* See before, note ⁿ.

¹ Sperabam quidem ex largo hoc quod in tractatu isto habetur scripturarum spicilegio, ad versionis Latinæ, quæ Hieronymianam præcessit, restitutionem, gradum aliquem præstui potuisse. Et certe, si modo sibi ubique constaret Cypriani textus, loca illa quæ a lectione vulgata discrepare deprehenduntur, pro antiquæ versionis reliquiis non inunerito haberemus. Sed cum ea sit

lectionum in Mss. codicibus varietas, ut plura simul occurrant, quæ a vulgatis discrepent; et in his quid a Cypriano scriptum fuerit, codicibus sibi invicem non respondentibus, minime constet: porro, cum primorum seculorum patres in S. Scripturis laudandis diversimode se habeant; curam hanc ceu tantum non deploratam censemus. Annot. ad Testim. Libros, p. 17.

III. As I have already set before the eyes of my readers such numerous passages of scripture in the Christian writers, whose works we have perused, I might now perhaps begin to contract, and be more brief: however, I have determined to proceed in the method that has been hitherto taken, without much alteration, until we come below Eusebius of Cæsarea. And it is my design to omit nothing material, purely for the sake of brevity. Let such, therefore, as have not an opportunity of reading over the voluminous writings of the fathers, accept of the following account of the notice St. Cyprian has taken of the several books of the New Testament. I propose by this method to enable every one to judge in some measure of the difference between the books of Testimonies, as we now have them, and St. Cyprian's other pieces: and besides, there are several citations in this writer's works that deserve some remarks.

1. St. Cyprian speaks expressly of "four gospels, which he compares to the four rivers of paradise: these gospels are received by the church, and are her property, within her circuit; by which she is overflowed, and her plants are enabled to bear fruit. As (F) paradise had its four rivers, so the church has its four gospels.

2. In the second book of Testimonies: 'Likewise' in the gospel according to Matthew; *Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the king, behold there came wise men from the East to Jerusalem;* ch. ii. 1. 2. In this work is quoted also the first chapter of this * gospel. In other pieces this gospel is cited thus: 'Likewise' the Lord has commanded us in his gospel, *that we should call no man our father upon earth, forasmuch as one is our father who is in heaven;* ch. xxiii. 9. Again: in the 'gospel' the Lord speaks and says; *He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me,* and what follows.'

3. In the third book of Testimonies: 'Likewise' in the gospel according to Mark; *And when ye stand praying forgive, if*

* Ecclesie paradisi instar exprimens, arbores fructiferas intra muros suos intus includit, ex quibus quæ non facit fructum bonum, exciditur, et in ignem mittitur. Has arbores rigat quatuor fluminibus, id est, Evangeliiis quatuor, quibus baptismi gratiam salutaris cœlesti inundatione largitur. Num quid de ecclesie fontibus rigare potest, qui intus in ecclesia non est? Ep. 73. p. 202.

(F) See Mr. Nath. Marshall's note upon the place. p. 235.

* Item in evangelio cata Matthæum: Et cum Jesus natus esset in Bethlehem Ju-

dæ in diebus Herodis regis. . . . Testim. l. ii. cap. 29. p. 50.

* Lib. ii. cap. 6. et 7. p. 36. y Item Dominus in evangelio suo præcepit, ne vocemus nobis patrem in terra, &c. De Orat. Dom. p. 142.

z In evangelio Dominus loquitur et dicit: Qui diligit patrem aut matrem super me, non est me dignus. De Exhorta. Mart. cap. 6. p. 173.

a In evangelio; in prece quotidiana: Remitte nobis debita nostra. . . . [Matth. vi. 12.] Item cata Marcum: Et cum steteritis ad orationem, remittite, &c. Test. lib. iii. cap. 22. p. 72.

'ye have ought against any, that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses;' ch. xi. 25, 26. So this gospel is several times quoted in this work: in other tracts after this manner; 'Whom^b the Lord reproves and blames in his gospel, saying; *Ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition;*' ch. vii. 9.

4. In the first book of Testimonies: 'Likewise^c in the gospel according to Luke; *And it came to pass, that when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary the babe leaped in her womb, and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost. . .*' Luke i. 41, 42, 43. In the tract on the Lord's Prayer; 'Which^d the Lord teacheth in his gospel, saying; *Two men went up to the temple to pray, the one a pharisee, the other a publican;*' to the end of the parable, ch. xviii. 10. . . 14. Again: 'So^e the widow Anna, as it is written in the gospel, *departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers, night and day;*' ch. ii. 37.

5. In the first book of Testimonies: 'Likewise^f in the gospel according to John; *He came to his own, and his own received him not. As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name;*' ch. i. 11, 12. In^g the next book of Testimonies he quotes the first five verses of this gospel. In one of his epistles: 'Let^h them imitate the Lord, who near the time of his passion was not more proud, but more humble; for then he washed his disciples feet, saying; *If I your lord and master have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash the feet of others; for I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done;*' John xiii. 14, 15.

IV. The book of the Acts of the apostles is frequently quoted by St. Cyprian by that title; but he has no where, that I remember, mentioned the name of the writer. 'According toⁱ what Peter says to the Jews in the Acts of the apostles; (ch. ii. 38)

^b Quos increpat Dominus et objurgat in evangelio suo dicens: Rejicitis mandatum Dei, ut traditionem vestram statuatis. De Unitate Eccl. p. 117. ^c Item in evangelio cata Lucam: Et factum est, ut audivit salutationem Mariæ Elisabeth. Testim. l. i. cap. 8. p. 37.

^d Quæ Dominus in evangelio suo ponit et dicit: Homines duo ascenderunt in templum orare, unus phariseus, et unus publicanus. De Orat. Dom. p. 141. ^e Sic Anna vidua, . . . sicut in evangelio scriptum est. ib. p. 155.

^f Item in evangelio cata Joannem: In sua propria venit, et sui eum non receperunt. Testim. l. i. cap. 3. p. 21. ^g Lib.

ii. cap. 3. p. 32.

^h Imitentur Dominum, qui sub ipso tempore passionis non superior, sed humilior fuit. Tunc enim apostolorum [discipulorum, Baluz.] suorum pedes lavit, dicens: Si ego lavi pedes vestros magister et dominus, et vos debetis aliorum pedes lavare. Exemplum enim dedi vobis, ut sicut ego feci et vos faciatis. Ep. 14. [juxta Pamel. vi. Baluz. v.] p. 32.

ⁱ Secundum quod in Actis apostolorum Petrus ad eos loquitur, et dicit: Penite-mini, et baptizetur unusquisque vestrum in nomine Domini Jesu Christi. . . Ep. 73. p. 205.

'Repent,

'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' Again: 'As ^k we read in the Acts of the apostles; (ch. iv. 32) *And the multitude of them that believed acted with one heart and soul.*' The same text is expressly quoted in another place, as scripture: 'This ^l is evident from the divine scripture, which says; *The multitude of them that believed acted with one heart and soul,*' that is, with great unanimity. Accordingly this book is cited by St. Cyprian for proof of what he asserts. Having quoted the book of Tobit, he adds: 'Nor ^m do we so allege these things, my brethren, as not to prove what the angel Raphael says [in Tobit] by the testimony of truth. In the Acts of the apostles the truth of this is shewed; and that souls are delivered by alms not only from the second, but likewise from the first death, is made manifest by fact and experience.' For this he alleges the history of Tabitha, Acts ix. 36. . . 41.

I must add one quotation more. In the third book of Testimonies: 'Likewise in ⁿ the Acts of the apostles, (ch. xv. 28, 29) *It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no other burden than these things, which are of necessity, [or, these necessary things;] that ye abstain from idolatries, and effusion of blood, and fornication. And whatever things ye would not should be done unto you, neither do ye unto others.*' This is a very extraordinary reading, and requires some remarks.

We ought here to recollect the substance of Stephen Baluze's note before referred to; That these books of Testimonies are very much interpolated, and that whereas he had one and twenty manuscript copies of them, five of those manuscripts wanted the third book. Moreover, in ^o his note upon the passage just transcribed, he mentions one copy, where this passage, and what follows to the end of the third book, is wanting: so that this passage was wanting in six copies of the one and twenty.

^k Sicut legimus in Actis apostolorum: Turba autem eorum qui crediderant, anima et mente una agebant. De Opere et Eleemosynis, p. 208. ^l Probat scriptura divina quæ dicit: De Unit. Eccl. p. 119. ^m Nec sic, fratres carissimi, ista proferimus, ut non quod Raphael angelus dixit veritatis testimonio comprobemus. In Actibus apostolorum facti fides posita est, et quod eleemosynis non tantum a secunda, sed a prima morte animæ liberentur, gestæ et impletæ rei probatione comprobatur. Tabitha operationibus justis

et eleemosynis præstandis plurimum dedita, &c. De Opere et Eleem. p. 199.

ⁿ Item in Actibus apostolorum: Visum est Sancto Spiritui et nobis, nullam vobis imponere sarcinam, quam ista, quæ ex necessitate sunt; abstinere vos ab idololatriis, et sanguinis effusione, et fornicatione. Et quæcunque vobis fieri non vultis, aliis ne feceritis. Testim. l. iii. cap. 119.

^o Ista et quæ deinceps sequuntur usque ad finem libri defunt in codice Gratianopolitano. Baluz. Not. p. 601.

I shall immediately observe a place in Irenæus, or rather in the Latin version of that father, where the texts of Acts xv. 20 and 29, are quoted very agreeably to the reading we have before us. In that place is recited Acts xv. from v. 7. to v. 29. There James in his speech says; ‘Wherefore^p my sentence is, that
 ‘we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God;
 ‘but that we command them to abstain from the vanity of idols, and
 ‘from fornication, and from blood: and that whatever things they
 ‘would not have done unto them, neither should they do unto others.’
 And afterwards, reciting the epistle itself; ‘For^q it seemed good
 ‘to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than
 ‘these, which are necessary things: That ye abstain from things sacrificed
 ‘to idols, and blood, and fornication: and that whatever things ye
 ‘would not have done unto you, neither should ye do unto others: from
 ‘which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well, walking in the Holy Ghost.’

This Latin version of Irenæus was not published, according to Mr. Dodwell’s^r computation, till some time after the year of Christ 385; though^s Massuet thinks it more ancient by a great deal; and^t Mill supposeth that it was made in Irenæus’s life-time, or soon after his death, before the end of the second century: but I am apt to think that Dodwell’s date of this translation is early enough; and possibly some readings of texts in this translation, as we now have it, were not in being till afterwards.

Here the principal differences from our present reading may be reckoned two; an omission, and an addition. The omission is of that particular, *things strangled*; the addition is of a precept, or prohibition rather, *not to do to others what they would not have to be done to themselves*. However, there are likewise some other variations that may require some notice as we go along.

1. To begin with the omission. Dr. Mill,^u in his notes upon

^p Propterea ego secundum me judico, non molestari eos, qui ex Gentibus convertuntur ad Deum; sed præcipiendum eis, uti abstineant a vanitatibus idolorum, et a fornicatione, et a sanguine: et quæcunque nolunt sibi fieri, aliis ne faciant. Iren. contr. Har. lib. iii. c. 12. p. 199. Massuet. ^q Placuit enim Sancto Spiritui, et nobis, nullum amplius vobis pondus imponere, quam hæc, quæ sunt necessaria: ut abstinere ab idolothytis, et sanguine, et fornicatione: et quæcunque non vultis fieri vobis, aliis ne faciatis: a quibus custodientes vos ipsos, bene agetis ambulantes in Spiritu Sancto. ibid. ^r Vid. Diff. Iren. v. num. 9, 10. ^s Massuet. Diff. in Iren. ii. num. 53, 54. ^t Mill.

Prol. n. 608. ^u Καὶ τὴν τρίτην.] Omitunt Cant. Iren. l. iii. c. 12. Tert. de Pud. c. 12. Cyprian. l. iii. ad Quirin. Hieron. Com. in Galat. v. (qui tamen in nonnullis exemplaribus scriptum dicit, *et a suffocatis*;) Ambros. in Galat. ii. (qui additum vult a sophistis Græcorum quos vocat;) Augustin. ut et Gaudentius ac Eucherius, quibus interpretamenti loco additum videtur τὸ πικτόν. Per sanguinem enim hic sanguinem suffocatum intelligi putant. Caterum retinet Græca quæ quidem vidimus omnia, (excepto uno Cant.) Versiones omnes, etiam Vulgata Lat. Orig. lib. viii. Contra Celsum, Patres et Tractatores Græci universim; ut proinde minime sollicitandum arbitrer. Mill. in Act. Ap. 15, 20.

p. 783.

Acts xv. 20, is by all means for retaining *and things strangled* in the text, as the right reading: but in his Prolegomena ^w he expresseth himself as strongly on the other side that this particular is an interpolation of the original text. But let us see whether we cannot hold that learned writer to his first opinion.

He owns that all the Greek manuscripts of the Acts of the apostles have this article of the decree **except** one; and all versions, and likewise all the Greek fathers and commentators in general: and it is very observable, that among those Greek fathers there are two of great antiquity who have cited the decree as we now have it; I mean ^x Clement of Alexandria, who has so cited it in two places, and (c) Origen. After this, what good authority can there be for the omission? Let us attend.

The main thing seems to be this, that as Dr. Mill supposeth the Italic version, as it is called, (that is the ancient Latin version, chiefly in use among the Latin Christians before St. Jerom's time, and made, as ^y Mill thinks, about the end of the second century) had only three particulars in the decree, omitting *things strangled*. But allowing this, it would not prove that to be the right reading; for, that *things strangled* were in some ancient Greek copies, and those good copies, is apparent from Clement and Origen: therefore it is probable that the ancient Latin version, if it wanted that article, was corrupted in this place; as, it is not unlikely, it might be also in many other.

But I see no certain nor probable evidence that the most ancient Latin version, or any Latin version whatever, before the end of the second century, wanted this particular. Indeed, Jerom^z informs us, that in his time some Latin copies had *things*

^w Καὶ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τοῦ αἵματος.] Act. xv. 20, 29. Cant. Irenæi interpres, Tert. Cyprian. Pacian. Ambr. Gaudentius, Eucherius, Fulgentius, Hieron. alii. Certe medium, καὶ τὴν πικτίαν, ipsius Lucæ non est, sed Christianorum veterum, qui cum in hac epistola synodica omnem sanguinis etiam sibi interdictum vidissent; eousque decretum extendebant, ut etiam a morticinis eo ipso sibi abstinendum fuisse censuerint; ne quo modo scilicet sanguine contaminarentur, vel inter viscera sepulto; ut loquitur Tertullianus. Ex hac ecclesiæ praxi adscripsit quispiam, haud dubito, *τὴν πικτίαν*, ad marginem codicis: quo ostenderetur in præcepto de abstinentiâ a sanguine, includi etiam abstinentiam a morticino, adeoque a quolibet suffocato. Hoc autem, seu partem textus genuinam, transtulerunt scribæ in corpus epistolæ hujus synodicæ, jam ante tempora Clementis

Alexandrini. Mill. Proleg. n. 441, 442. ed. Kuster. vid. etiam n. 641.

^x Εδοξε, ἔφασαν, τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν, μηδὲν πλὴν ἐπιθεσθαι υμῖν βαρὺς, πλὴν τῶν ὑπαναγκῆς ἀπιχεσθαι ἰδολοθύτων, καὶ αἵματος, καὶ πικτίων, καὶ τῆς πορνείας· ἐξ ὧν διατηρητέες αὐτὰς εὖ πράξετε. Clem. Al. Pæd. I. ii. cap. 7. p. 172. B. C. Paris. Vid. etiam Strom. lib. iv. p. 512. D. 513. A. (c) See of this work Vol. ii. ch. 38. num. 28. ^y Vid. Mill. Proleg. num. 377, &c. ^z In Actibus apostolorum narrat historia: . . . Seniores qui Jerosolymis erant, et apostolos pariter congregatos, statuisse per literas, ne superponeretur eis jugum legis, nec amplius observarent, nisi ut custodierent se ab idolothytis, et sanguine, et fornicatione: sive ut in nonnullis exemplaribus scriptum est, *et a suffocatis*. Hieron. Comm. in Ep. al. Gal. cap. v. 2.

strangled,

strangled, others not: but he does not say that they which wanted that particular were the best or the most exact. It is highly probable that he preferred those which had it; inserting it ^a in the Latin New Testament ^b published by him, corrected by the Greek; as it is now also the reading of the Latin vulgate.

Having thus considered this passage of Jerom, which I take to be one of Mill's main authorities for his supposition that the ancient Italic version wanted this particular, I shall now take things in the order of time: but we have no occasion to review the Greek writers, their sentiment having been already sufficiently owned. I would only just observe, that we have no way of knowing how Irenæus read this portion of scripture; his Greek being lost, and his Latin interpreter not strictly following his Greek original, but putting texts of scripture according to the Latin version in use in his time, as is fairly owned by ^c Mill himself; and possibly sometimes altering and corrupting even that according to his own sentiments, or the prevailing sentiments of the time in which he lived.

As for Tertullian, one would be apt to conclude, from his ^d Apology, written about the year 200, that he read all four things as we do. He then plainly understood the decree of the council at Jerusalem, to prohibit *things strangled*: and it is supposed that at that time, and for some while afterwards, all Christians in general understood the decree to prohibit the eating the blood of brute animals. There are remaining ^e passages of ancient writings that seem to put this matter beyond all dispute. Nevertheless, Tertullian, ^f in his treatise De Pudicitia, written after his Apology, though the time is not exactly known, quotes the de-

^a Vid. Mill. Proleg. num. 849.

^b Novum Testamentum Græcæ fidei reddidi. Hieron. De V. I. cap. 135.

^c In Latinis autem, [Irenæi,] Interpreti id unum curæ erat, ut scripturæ testimonia, quæ in hoc opere occurrunt, exprimerentur verbis interpretationis, quæ Celticis suis, totique occidenti jam in usu erat, Italicæ, sive vulgatæ. Unde factum, ut paucis in locis, nec nisi ex contextu orationis, certo satis assequi possis, quamnam fuerit codicis Irenæani lectio. Mill. Pr. n. 368.

^d Erubescat error vester Christianis, qui ne animalium quidem sanguinem in epulis eiculentis habemus; qui propterea quoque suffocatis et morticinis abstinemus, ne quo sanguine contaminemur, vel intra viscera sepulto, &c. Apol. cap. 9. p. 10. D.

^e πῶς αὖ παῖδια φάγοντες οἱ τῶντοι, οὐς μὴ αὐτοὶ ζῶντα αἷμα φάγειν εἶον; Epist.

Eccles. Vienn. et Lugd. ap. Euseb. H. E. l. v. cap. 1. p. 159. A. Vid. etiam Clem. Al. Pæd. lib. ii. cap. 7. p. 172. B. C. Strom. l. iv. p. 512, 513. A. et Pæd. l. iii. cap. 3. p. 228. B. C. Tertullian ut supra, Ap. cap. 9. Vid. etiam Origenem ut laudatum supra p. 153. note G. Tantumque ab humano sanguine cavemus, ut nec edulium pecorum in cibis sanguinem noverimus. Minuc. Fel. cap. 30.

^f Visum est, inquit, Spiritui Sancto et nobis, nullum amplius vobis adjicere pondus, quam eorum, a quibus necesse est abstinere, a sacrificiis, et a fornicationibus, et sanguine, a quibus observando recte agitis, vestante vos Spiritu Sancto. Sufficit et hic servatum esse machiæ et fornicationis locum honoris sui inter idololatriam et homicidium. Interdictum enim sanguinis multo magis humani intelligemus. de Pud. c. 12.

p. 788.

cree, as if he read only three things: but then it is observable that he there seems disposed to understand the prohibition of *blood* concerning murder or homicide; at least, he would bring in this by way of consequence. And besides, there is too much reason to suspect that this interpretation is given or hinted by him to serve a particular purpose, and increase the malignity and scandal of fornication.

The next author cited by Mill is St. Cyprian. I have transcribed the passage above ^s at length. It is the passage that gives occasion to our present inquiry: but it has been shewn that we have no good reason to look upon it as Cyprian's. Indeed, it is highly probable that the reading we have now in this work is very late. In that passage every thing is to be understood as of a moral nature: instead of *blood* is put *effusion of blood*, that it might be the more certainly understood of murder, or homicide: for that this is what we are here to understand by *effusion of blood* I think cannot be questioned. I am sure Dr. Hammond ^h took this passage, or this writer, whoever he is, in that sense.

The next author is Ambrosiaster, author of the Commentary upon St. Paul's thirteen epistles, placed by Cave as flourishing about the year 354, who supposeth ⁱ the real author to be Hilary, deacon of Rome, and that this work was written about the year 384. Richard Simon ^k is of the same opinion concerning the author of these Commentaries: but ^l the Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose are not so clear upon this point. This writer, whoever he be, probably however of the fourth or fifth century, omits *things strangled*. He even contends that that clause ought to be left out, and that it is an interpolation of the Greek writers, or Greek sophists, as he calls them with much scorn and indignation. He ⁿ understands the prohibition *from blood*, of the blood of animals, not of homicide. We are obliged to him for one thing, the assurance he gives us that the Greek manuscripts of his time universally agreed in the clause, *and from things strangled*. If he had known of any Greek writers or Greek copies

^f See p. 151. ^h Vid. Hammond. Annot. in Act. xv. 29. ⁱ Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 168. ^k Hist. Crit. des Commentateurs du Neuf Testament, Ch. ix. p. 133. &c. ^l Vid. Admonit. in Commentaria in 13. Ep. Beati Pauli. Ed. Bened. ^m Denique tria hæc mandata ab apostolis et senioribus data reperiuntur, quæ ignorant leges Romane, id est, ut abstergerent se ab idololatria, et sanguine, sicut Noe, et fornicatione. Quæ sophistæ Græcorum non intelligentes, scientes tamen a

sanguine abstinendum, adulterarunt scripturam, quartum mandatum addentes, et a suffocato abstinendum. Ambrosiast. in Gal. cap. 2. p. 215. Ed. Bened.

ⁿ Ergo hæc illicita esse offensa sunt gentibus, quæ putabant licere: ac per hoc non utique ab homicidio prohibiti sunt, cum jubentur a sanguine observare. Sed hoc acceperunt, quod Noe a Deo didicerat, ut observarent se a sanguine edendo cum carne. Id. ibid. p. 214. F.

of the New Testament, that had favoured his omission, he would not have been quite so angry with the Greeks.

Pacian, bishop of Barcelona, about the year 370, is another writer who ^o omits *things strangled*. He understands *from blood*, to mean homicide; and says, that the direction given by the council, to abstain from these three crimes; *things sacrificed to idols*, or idolatry; *from blood*, or from murder; and *from fornication*; is the sum and substance of the whole gospel, or Christian revelation.

The next writer alleged by Mill is Gaudentius, placed by Cave at the year 387. He ^p seems to have read only three things, and understands *blood* of the blood of animals; for he explains it to mean *things strangled*: or, as ^a Mill expresseth it, Gaudentius and Eucherius thought this clause added by way of interpretation.

St. Augustine likewise, placed by Cave at the year 396, is ^r alleged upon this occasion by Dr. Mill: and, if the passage in the *Speculum* be his, he read only three prohibitions; *from things sacrificed to idols*, *from blood*, and *from fornication*. From this passage it appears, that by many at that time all these prohibitions were understood to be of a moral kind. Their explication of them is idolatry, murder, and fornication, which they therefore

^o Visum est enim Sancto Spiritui, et nobis, nullum amplius imponi vobis pondus, præterquam hæc: Necessè est, ut abstineatis vos ab idolothytis, et sanguine, et fornicatione: a quibus observantes, bene ageritis. Valet. Hæc est Novi Testamenti tota conclusio. Despectis in multis Spiritus Sanctus hæc nobis, capitalis periculi conditione, legavit. Reliqua peccata meliorum operum compensatione curantur. Hæc vero tria crimina, . . . ut veneni calix, ut lethalis arundo metuenda sunt. . . . Quid vero faciet contemptor Dei? Quid ager sanguinarius? Quod remedium capiet fornicator? Num quid aut placare Dominum desertor ipsius poterit? aut conservare sanguinem suum, qui fudit alienum? aut redintegrare Dei templum, qui illud fornicando violavit? Ista sunt capitalia, fratres, ista mortalia. Pacian Paræn. ad pœnit. T. iv. p. 315. H. Bibl. Patr.

^p Et idcirco Beatus Jacobus cum cæteris apostolis decretum tale constituit in ecclesiis observandum: *ut abstineatis vos, inquit, ab immolatis, et a sanguine*, id est, *a suffocatis*. Prætermiserunt homicidium, adulterium, et veneficia: quoniam nec nominari ea in ecclesiis oporteret, quæ legibus etiam gentilium punirentur. Prætermiserunt quoque illas omnes minutias

observationum legalium, et sola hæc quæ prædiximus custodienda sanxerunt; ne vel sacrificatis diabolo cibis profanemur immundis, vel ne mortuos [*ff. mortui*] per viscera suffocatorum animalium sanguine polluemur, vel ne in immunditiis fornicationum corpora nostra, quæ templa Dei sunt, violemus. Gaudent. de Macabæis, Tract. xv. Bibl. Patr. Max. Tom. v. p. 967. F. G. ^a ut et Gaudentius ac Eucherius, quibus interpretamenti loco additum videtur. Mill. ad Aët xv. 20.

^r Ubi videmus apostolos, eis qui ex gentibus crediderunt, nulla voluisse onera veteris legis imponere, quantum adinet ad corporalis abinentiam voluptatis; *nisi ut observarent ab his tribus, id est, ab eis quæ idolis immolarentur, et a sanguine, et a fornicatione*. Unde nonnulli putant tria tantum crimina esse mortalia, idololatriam, et homicidium, et fornicationem; ubi utique et adulterium, et omnis præter uxorem concubitus intelligitur: quasi non sint mortifera crimina quæcunque alia sunt præter hæc tria, quæ a regno Dei separant, aut inaniter et fallaciter dictum sit: *Neque fures, neque avari, neque ebrii, neque maledici, neque rapaces, regnum Dei possidebunt.* [1 Cor. vi. 10.] August. Specul. de Libro Aët. Apost. Tom. iii. Bened.

thought

p. 793.

thought to be the only three mortal sins. In ^s another place, Acts xxi. 25, is cited by Augustine, where *things strangled* are wanting. There is ^t yet another place, where Augustine speaks of this matter, and somewhat largely. Here again is mention made of the interpretation, which some gave of blood, meaning thereby murder; which sense Augustine himself rejects here, as he did before. Thence we learn likewise, that in St. Augustine's time the decree of the council in its ancient sense and interpretation was regarded ^u by very few Christians among the Latins, who thought all wholesome food, generally eaten by men, to be lawful; or, that they were under no obligation to observe a distinction of meats.

Beside these writers, Mill refers also to Eucherius of the fifth, and Fulgentius of the sixth century, as favouring the omission of the particular in dispute. But I do not think it needful to go any lower.

However, we ought not to pass by the one single manuscript on that side the question: it is the famous Cambridge manuscript, which ^w Mill owns, with Simon, to have been written in the western part of the world by a Latin scribe, and ^x to be interpolated and corrupted to a great degree. I put ^y in the margin the character which Mr. Weststein has lately given, in a few words, of this and some other manuscripts, in his preface to the late edition of Curcellæus's New Testament with various readings. That character will have a good deal of weight with those who are acquainted with the author's exact skill in this part of learning.

^s De gentibus autem qui crediderunt, nos mandavimus, judicantes, nihil ejusmodi servare illos, nisi ut se observent ab idolis immolato, et a sanguine, et a fornicatione. Aug. Ep. 82. n. 9. Bened. al. Ep. 19.

^t Et in Actibus apostolorum hoc lege præceptum ab apostolis, ut abstererent gentes tantum a fornicatione, et ab immolatis, et a sanguine; id est, ne quidquam ederent carnis, cujus sanguis non esset effusus. Quod alii non sic intelligunt, sed a sanguine præceptum esse abstinendum, ne quis homicidio se contaminet. Aug. Con. Faust. lib. xxxii. cap. 13.

^u ... quis jam hoc Christianus observat, ut turdos vel minutiores aviculas non attingat, nisi quarum sanguis effusus est, aut leporem non edat, si manu a cervice percussus, nullo cruento vulnere occisus est? Et qui forte pauci adhuc tangere ista formidant, a cæteris irridentur: ita omnium animos in hac re tenuit illa sententia veritatis, Non quod intrat in os vestrum, vos

coinquinat, sed quod exit; nullam cibi naturam, quam societas admittit humana, sed quæ iniquitas committit, peccata condemnans. Id. ibid.

^w Certe textus ipse Codicis, Græcus pariter ac Latinus, est Latini scribæ: quod ostendit Simonius Hist. Text. Nov. Test. cap. 30. Mill. Proleg. n. 1271.

^x Et jam quidem ad ipsius Codicis partes accedimus: Latina translationem Italicam exhibet, qualis tum temporis interpolata ferebatur, ante castigationem Hieronymi: Græca vero, textum mirifice corruptum, &c. Id. ib. num. 1272. ^y Inter Bodleianos codices ille qui Acta apostolorum continet, item Cantabrigiensis, et Claromontanus, ... a librario Latino scripti, et ad Versionem Italicam corruptam tam inepte atque imperite deformati atque depravati sunt, ut risum moveant, qui illis locum dignitatemque genuinorum Codicum Græcorum conciliare studuerunt. Præfat. in Nov. Test. Amstel. 1735.

I think

I think it may not be amiss for us now to collect the evidence we have had before us, in a few propositions.

(1.) All the Greek writers read this text as we now have it in our Greek copies; and some of those Greek writers are very ancient, having flourished in the second century, or the beginning of the third.

(2.) All Christians in general, all over the world, Greeks and Latins, in the second century, and probably in the third likewise, understood the decree of the council at Jerusalem to forbid the eating the blood of brute animals.

(3.) There is no clear proof, that in any Latin version, or any copies of the New Testament, of the second or third century, the reading of this text was different from ours; for the passages in the version of Irenæus, and in the testimonies of Cyprian, are not to be relied upon as genuine. And Tertullian may be reckoned to afford as much evidence for the common reading as against it. Jerom bears witness only for the reading of some Latin copies in his time, without saying that they who wanted this particular were ancient; and the other writers alleged by Mill, who cite the text without *things strangled*, are likewise of the fourth century, or later.

(4.) We see a probable rise and occasion of omitting *things strangled* in some Latin copies about that time; I mean the fourth century, or toward the end of it: among the Christians of the western part of the Roman empire, where the Latin tongue chiefly obtained, the decree of the council of Jerusalem ceased to be observed according to its original intent and meaning, and most ancient interpretation. As they no longer observed a distinction of meats, and often eat things strangled without any scruple, some took an unwarrantable liberty with the text, and left that particular out of their copies; that their conduct might not seem to be expressly condemned by a command or advice given by apostles and elders in council assembled. Now also it became a common thing, though not universal, to interpret that particular, *from blood*, as a prohibition of homicide. These two things at least are extremely manifest; that at the end of the fourth century, and the beginning of the fifth, many among the Latin Christians neglected the distinction of meats, and likewise understood that prohibition in the sense just mentioned. And I think it may be hence collected with probability, that this gave occasion for leaving out *things strangled* in some copies; for that clause appeared unsuitable to the general practice, and was a strong objection to a common interpretation of another article

in

p. 797.

in the decree. In the passage, as it stands in the version of Irenæus, and in Cyprian's Testimonies, every thing in the proposal of James, and in the epistle of the council, is of a moral nature. This affords ground for suspicion of an undue liberty taken with the text, to make it agree with the prevailing sentiments and practices of some Christians of later times. The passage in Cyprian's third book of Testimonies is absolutely unjustifiable in two particulars; *from idolatries*, and *from effusion of blood*; which are readings altogether unsupported by good authorities, and I suppose will not now be defended by any man of sense.

(5.) As for the Cambridge manuscript, it deserves no farther notice here. One single manuscript, and that corrupted and interpolated, can never be equal to many, to all other; no more than one witness, and he a suspected one, ought to be credited against forty others, and more.

(6.) I suppose it then to be highly probable, that our present common reading of this text is right; as I believe the first Christians understood it right, when they took it to contain advice to abstain from eating the blood of animals.

2. We are now to take into consideration the addition to our common text; Acts xv. 20 and 29; which is, *And whatever things ye would not should be done unto you, neither do ye unto others*. Of this I have already taken some notice in (H) the chapter of Theophilus bishop of Antioch, about the year 181, because Dr. Mill^a had mentioned it as a conjecture of his, that that ancient father had referred to this reading in the Acts. But I then intimated, that I thought that conjecture to be entirely without foundation; and I gave some reasons, which I supposed might be satisfactory. I am now more fully confirmed in the same opinion, and think there is not any the least ground to suppose, that Theophilus referred to this additional reading in the Acts. For, first, there is no reason to believe that this prohibition, or precept, call it what you please, was then in any copy of the Acts, as shall be shewn more distinctly by and by. Secondly, allowing this prohibition to have been then in the Acts, yet Theophilus did not refer to it, but rather to some text of the gospels, where this equitable rule is spoken of as the doctrine of the prophets; if indeed Theophilus referred at all to any part of the New Testament, and not solely to the writings of the prophets. And, since the publication of the forecited volume, I have observed that the learned Mr. Wolff,^a in his edition of

(H) See Vol. ii. chap. xx. ^a Vid. Mill. ad Act. xv. 20.

^a Vid. Theoph. ad autol. l. ii. cap. 49. p. 228. Hamburg. 1724.

Theophilus,

Theophilus, (which I had not then seen) puts in the marginal note upon that passage of his author a reference to Luke vi. 34; which certainly is not improperly done; though I think it altogether as likely that Theophilus referred to Matt. vii. 12, or xxii. 40; if indeed he referred to any text of the New Testament. But, upon the whole, it appears to me somewhat probable, that Theophilus referred to the writings of the prophets themselves, and to them only; and I should think it must appear so to others likewise, who are pleased to read and consider his context.

Though Mill had a conjecture that Theophilus referred to this additional reading in the Acts, yet, with his wonted critical skill, he supposed this reading not to be genuine, but an interpolation, however ancient; which opinion I shall endeavour to support, except that I do not judge this interpolation to be very ancient, but very modern: nevertheless, that judicious critic has an observation upon this reading, as it stands in Acts xv. 29, which will not hold; for he says that this reading in that place disturbs the sense, and breaks the connection; which indeed it would do, if this rule were there delivered in a preceptive, positive form: but as they who had this reading put that equitable rule here in negative terms, in the form of a prohibition, the sense is not disturbed; and it might be added after this, as well as after the foregoing particulars; *from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well.*

The authorities for this additional reading are represented by Mill in his notes upon Acts xv. 20 and 29. They consist of eight manuscripts, five of which have this additional clause at v. 20; and three more at v. 29; one version, and three Christian writers. All these authorities, especially the manuscripts, we shall observe particularly; and, as we examine their character and quality, we may possibly see reason to reduce their number.

The first manuscript alleged for this reading is that called Stevens's second manuscript. According to Mill himself, this manuscript^b is very much interpolated, especially in the Acts. He thinks this Greek manuscript agrees so much with the Latin vulgate, that he cannot but conclude it to have been corrected, or formed upon that translation, and even a corrupt and faulty copy of that translation. This judgment of our Mill upon this manuscript of Stephens is very observable; but Mr. Wetstein^c asserts, and proves it to be the same with that called Beza's manuscript, or the manuscript of Cambridge.

^b . . . quæ haud concordarent cum versione vulgata, et quidem codice ejus corrupto, glossematibusque, et subinde integris περιωπαις satis prolixis, in Actis

præsertim apostolorum interpolato. Mill. Proleg. n. 1160. ^c Vid. Proleg. ad Nov. Test. Gr. edit. accuratissimam. cap. 4. p. 22. . . . 27.

The next is Stephens's tenth manuscript, which ^d Mill says likewise agrees mightily with the Latin vulgate.

The third is the Cambridge manuscript. We formerly shewed sufficiently what is its character : and are here farther to take notice, that it has been just now observed to be the same with Stephens's second manuscript. Mill therefore, though without knowing it, has twice mentioned one and the same manuscript under different names.

The fourth is a Geneva manuscript, of ^e which Mill gives a good character, though he thinks the scribe to have been careless and ignorant.

The fifth is that called Covel's fourth manuscript, which Mill says is a ^f modern, or late manuscript.

These are all the manuscripts, which are put by Mill in his notes upon Acts xv. 20, as having this additional reading. At v. 29 some more are mentioned, as having it there.

The first of these, and the sixth in our order, is that which Mill calls Stephens's first manuscript; by which Mill means the Complutensian edition, as ^g he has himself informed us. Therefore this is not a manuscript, but a printed copy.

The next, or seventh, is Laud's second. It agrees mightily with that in the Vatican, as ^h Mill says.

The last, and eighth, is the Seidelian manuscript, mentioned by Kuster, supposed to ⁱ be about seven hundred years old, or written in the tenth century.

These are all the manuscripts said to have this additional clause. As placed in Mill's New Testament, they appear to be eight in number; but are really six only; Stephens's second manuscript being the same with that ^j Cambridge; and Stephens's first manuscript, as it is called, being no manuscript, but a printed copy.

The only version that has this reading is the Ethiopic, a very inaccurate version, as some think, and of little value; by some others, however, it is judged not to be contemptible: I may not stay to examine its merit particularly; I therefore refer ^k to divers learned writers upon this head, who may be consulted by such as have leisure. I shall only observe, that it very seldom can be reasonable to follow one single version, where it differs

^a Mill. Proleg. n. 1171.

^b Ib. n. 1500.

^c Æthiop. p. 2. 3. et ejusd. Hist. Æthiop.

^d Manu recenti. ib. n. 1487.

lib. iii. cap. 4. Ri. Simon. Hist. Crit. des

^e Ib. n. 1159.

^f Ibid. n. 1439.

Verf. du. Nov. Test. Ch. xvii. p. 193, &c.

^g Vid. Kusteri Præf. in Mill. Nov. Test.

Mill. Proleg. num. 1188. 1189. Beausobre

^h p. 8. fin.

ⁱ Vid. Scalig. de Emenda-

bre et Lefant Pref. generale sur le Nov.

tion. Temp. 1. 7. p. 682. Walton Proleg.

Test. page 213.

^j xv. p. 67. &c. Ludolf Præf. in Lexicon

from all others; especially when that version has no evidences of early antiquity, neither internal nor external, but what are very doubtful and uncertain.

The Christian writers mentioned by Mill are, St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, and Rabanus in the ninth century; for as for Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, Mill does not place him with these three. That learned critic mentioned it only as a conjecture, that possibly Theophilus might refer to this reading in the Acts. But I have already shewn that conjecture to be without foundation; because, even allowing this clause to have been then in the copies of the Acts of the apostles, there is no reason to think Theophilus referred to this text, but rather to some text in the gospels, if he refers to any place at all of the New Testament; and likewise because there is no reason to suppose that this clause was then in the Acts, as we have now shewn in part, and proceed to shew still farther.

The only Christian writers, then, who favour this reading are the three above mentioned: but by Irenæus we are to understand only his Latin interpreter, whose age we do not certainly know; and possibly that translation has been interpolated in some places since it was first made. Nor are we by St. Cyprian to understand St. Cyprian himself, but the interpolator of his third book of Testimonies, whose age we do not know, but possibly he lived as late as Rabanus, or since.

The very few, and those late quotations of this place in the Acts, according to this reading, shew it to be an interpolation, and that it never was in many copies of that book of scripture, and those only late copies.

Beside that we do not find this reading in the most ancient writers, nor in any one Greek writer whatever, there is positive evidence as to divers of the most ancient Christian writers, both Greek and Latin, that they had not this clause in their copies. This appears from their citations of the whole decree of the council at Jerusalem, together with the last farewell, or the concluding words of the decree of the apostles and elders, or from some remarks made by those writers upon the decree. I mean Clement of Alexandria, who has twice cited this text; Tertullian; Ambrosiaster, Pacian, Gaudentius, Augustine. I have above cited their passages very much at length, in considering that particular, *things strangled*, that every one might perceive as much. To those passages therefore, transcribed at the bottom of the page, I refer such as are pleased to examine them: and to those writers might be added Jerom. This shews, that in the fourth,

as well as more early centuries, this clause was wanting in most, and those the best, if not in all copies.

There is one thing more, which may deserve to be mentioned here: I do not perceive that this clause is found at Acts xxi. 25. in any manuscript copy of that book, or in any version, or writer whatever. This is an argument, that neither was it originally in Acts xv. 20. and 29: for if it had been originally in both those places, it would have appeared here likewise.

I think, then, that there is not any reason to suppose this precept, or prohibition, to have been originally put in their epistle by the apostles and elders assembled at Jerusalem: but, on the other hand, there is very good evidence, that it is an interpolation, probably inserted some time near the end of the fourth century, or afterwards, by some Latin Christian, in order to render the whole decree of the council agreeable to the sentiments and practices that prevailed in the age and place in which he lived; for the few manuscripts that have this reading are of small weight against the much greater number that want it. One version, corrupt too and inaccurate, as it seems, is of no authority against all others. The Christian writers that have followed this reading are so few, that they scarce deserve to be mentioned; especially considering, that the only one of them whose name we know is Rabanus, of the ninth century; for who was Irenæus's interpreter, and when he lived, and who was the interpolator of Cyprian's Testimonies, and when he lived, are things altogether uncertain and unknown.

I conclude, then, that the present readings of Acts xv. 20. and 29. in our ordinary copies of the New Testament are the true and genuine original readings: or, to be a little more particular and distinct, in proportion to the evidence of things, I reckon it highly probable, that the clause, *and from things strangled*, was originally in the decree; and certain that, according to the most ancient interpretation of the decree, it was understood by all Christians in general to forbid eating the blood of brute animals. As for the additional article, which we have just now considered, it is plainly an interpolation; and, unless there be some other evidence for it, which I am unacquainted with, I do not see how it can be received as a part of the apostolical decree by any Christian critic, who is duly concerned for the integrity and purity of the sacred scriptures.

I have insisted thus long upon the reading of this portion of scripture, not only because Mill himself had pronounced a wrong judgment upon it in his Prolegomena, as I conceive, but be-

cause there is an agreement to the like purpose in ¹ Curcellæus, for leaving out the clause of *things strangled*. And I am apprehensive that, unless we retain the true reading of this place, for the main part at least, we shall not rightly understand it; nor shall we, unless we have the true sense and design of this decree, maintain, as we ought to do, the dignity of the apostolical character and commission. Finally, the misunderstanding of this decree must be to the prejudice of the Christian revelation itself, in the esteem of many.

Having now, as I hope, settled the true reading of the determination of the apostles and elders upon the point in controversy at that time, I wish I were likewise able to explain that determination to the satisfaction of the scrupulous and the judicious: but such a performance, even supposing that ability, would require a longer digression than could be allowed of in this place; for which reason that attempt must be deferred.

V. We are in the next place to consider St. Cyprian's testimony to the epistles of the apostle Paul.

1. 'According^m to what the blessed apostle Paul writes in his epistle to the Romans; *Every one shall give an account of himself: therefore let us not judge one another:*' ch. xiv. 12. 13.

2. He quotes the latter part of the first chapter of the epistle to the Romans very agreeably to the reading we saw formerly (1) in Clement of Rome, ver. 32. '*Who,*' saysⁿ he, *when they knew the righteousness of God, did not consider, that they who do such things are worthy of death; nor only they who commit them, but they also who consent to them that do them.*' The meaning of the text, according to this reading, is, that not only they who actually commit the sins before-mentioned, are liable to punishment, but they also who approve of, and consent to such evil things. So it is said of Paul, that^o he was *consenting to Stephen's death*, Acts viii. 1.

3. In the first book of Testimonies: '*In^p the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians; Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud.*

¹ Vid. Curcellæi Diatr. de Esu sanguinis inter Christianos. cap. 11. ^m Secundum quod beatus apostolus Paulus in epistola sua ad Romanos scribit et dicit: Unusquisque nostrum pro se rationem dabit; non ergo nos invicem judicemus. Cypr. Ep. 69. al. 76. p. 188. (1) See Vol. i. p. 35. ⁿ Sed et hoc idem Paulus apostolus scribit et dicit: . . . qui cum justitiam Dei cognovissent, non intellexerunt,

quoniam qui talia agunt, morte sunt digni, non tantum qui faciunt ea, sed et qui consentiunt eis qui hæc agunt. Ep. 67. al. 68. p. 175. ^o Σαυλος δὲ ὡς συνενόησεν τὴν ἀναίρεσιν αὐτοῦ. ^p In epistola Pauli ad Corinthios prima: Nolo enim vos ignorare, fratres, quia patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt. Item in epistola ad Corinthios secunda: Obtusi sunt sensus eorum, &c. Testim. lib. i. cap. 4. p. 22.

‘Likewise in the second epistle to the Corinthians; *Their minds are blinded unto this day:*’ see 1 Cor. x. i. and 2 Cor. iii. 13. 14.

4. In one of his epistles, ‘The^a blessed apostle Paul also chosen and sent of the Lord, and appointed preacher of the gospel, says the same thing in his epistle; *The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and, giving thanks, broke it, and said, This is my body, which will be given for you: this do in remembrance of me:*’ 1 Cor. xi. 23. 24.

5. In one of his tracts: ‘Likewise^a the blessed apostle Paul, full of the inspiration of the Lord; *Now be that ministereth,*’ says he, ‘*seed to the sower, will both minister bread for your food, and multiply your seed sown, and encrease the fruits of your righteousness, that ye may be enriched in all things:*’ 2 Cor. ix. 10. 11.

6. In the first book of Testimonies, ‘Likewise^a Paul to the Galatians; *But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman...*’ Gal. iv. 4. In another work, ‘The^a apostle Paul, admonishing and saying, *Therefore, whilst we have opportunity, let us do good to all men, especially to them who are of the household of faith. And let us not be weary in well doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not:*’ so he transposeth the words of these two verses, Gal. vi. 10. 9.

7. St. Cyprian expressly quotes the epistle to the Ephesians, not only in the third book of^a Testimonies, but likewise in one of his epistles, after this manner: ‘But^w the apostle Paul, speaking of the same thing more clearly and plainly, writes to the Ephesians and says; *Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water;*’ Eph. v. 25. 26. The text cited in the Testimonies is, ch. iv. 30, *And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were sealed in the day of redemption:* which is a remarkable and uncommon reading. However, it is found again in^x St. Augustine.

^a Beatus quoque apostolus Paulus, a domino electus et missus, et prædicator veritatis evangelicæ constitutus, hæc eadem in epistola sua ponit, dicens: Dominus Jesus in qua nocte tradebatur accepit panem, et gratias agens [egit et Baluz.] fregit, et dixit: hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, &c. Ep. 63. p. 152. ^r Item beatus apostolus Paulus dominicæ inspirationis gratia plenus: Qui administrat, inquit, &c. De Op. et Eleem. ^s Item Paulus ad Galatas: at ubi advenit impletio temporis, misit Deus filium suum natum de muliere. Testim. l. i. c. 8. p. 37. ^t Paulo apostolo ad-

monente et dicente: Ergo dum tempus habemus, &c. De Op. et Eleem. p. 208.

^u Paulus ad Ephesios: Nolite contristare Spiritum Sanctum Dei, in quo signati estis in die redemptionis. Test. l. iii. cap. 7. p. 64. ^w Sed et Paulus apostolus hoc idem adhuc apertius et clarius manifestans ad Ephesios scribit et dicit: Christus dilexit ecclesiam. &c. Ep. 69. al. 76. p. 181.

^x Ex hoc locutionis modo arbitrator dictum illud ab apostolo: Nolite contristare Spiritum Sanctum Dei, in quo signati estis in die redemptionis. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. iv. n. 18. p. 166. B. Tom. iii. P. i. Bened.

8. In the third book of Testimonies, 'Likewise ^y Paul to the Philippians; *Who being appointed in the form of God, did not earnestly affect to be equal to God, but made himself of no reputation, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of man, and found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross:*' Philip. ii. 6. 7. 8. The same passage is likewise found in the second book of Cyprian's ^z Testimonies, and plainly in the same sense. I have already quoted (κ) this passage from some Greek writers, who interpret this text according to the translation just given. It is likewise found again, and plainly in the same sense, in ^a Novatus, or Novatian, as he is usually called, a Latin author, and contemporary with St. Cyprian. Mr. Marshall translates the first words of the passage above quoted from the third book of Cyprian's Testimonies in this manner: That though he was appointed to appear in the form of God, he did not boast of his equality with God, but emptied himself. And besides, Mr. Marshall has a long and judicious note upon this citation of our author: he says, 'he cannot acquiesce in our common construction of the words, *thought it no robbery*, &c. as if they intimated any thing like to his claiming an equality; because the apostle here is speaking of our Saviour's humility and condescension, and rather represents him as receding from his just rights, than as insisting on them. Though he received so much honour from his Father, and was appointed to represent his person, yet when he came to suffer, he did not insist on his first pretensions; did not seem (then) to think he had any claim to the divinity, or might assume it; boasted not (then) of his near alliance to the Deity; but, instead of it, emptied himself, behaved and acted like a person void of any such powers. Novatian, in his book De Trinitate, cap. 17. understands our apostle in this sense; which I must acknowledge, with Mr. Le Clerc, seems to me the most natural and easy. See Mr. Le Clerc upon the place in his Supplement to Dr. Hammond; and Dr. Whitby, who gives instances out of Heliodorus, wherein the words *απαγμα νηπι*, which we translate *thinking a robbery*, plainly signify catching at an opportunity, embracing any thing as extremely desirable.'

^y Item Paulus ad Philipenses: Qui in figura Dei constitutus, non rapinam arbitratus est esse se æqualem Deo, sed se exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudinem hominis factus, et habitu inventus ut homo. Humiliavit se, factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis. Test. l. iii. c. 39. p. 76. ^z Test. l. ii.

cap. 13. (κ) See Vol. ii. ch. 16. n. 7. ch. 38. n. 28. ^a Qui cum in forma Dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est æqualem se Deo esse; sed semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudine hominum factus, &c. Novat. de Reg. Fid. cap. 22. [al. 17.] p. 174. edit. Jo. Jackl.

So writes Mr. Marshall. Mr. Wolff ** has discoursed largely of this matter, and deserves to be consulted.

9. That passage, as was observed, is in Cyprian's books of Testimonies. In another work, 'Mindful ^b of which the blessed apostle Paul says in his epistle [or in one of his epistles]: 'For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain:' Philip. i. 21.

10. In the third book of Testimonies; 'In ^c the epistle of Paul to the Colossians; *Continue in prayer, watching in the same*: Coloss. iv. 2. In another work: 'Likewise ^d the blessed apostle Paul, full of the Holy Ghost, and sent to call and convert the Gentiles, warns and teaches; *Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ: for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead*:' Col. ii. 8.

11. In the books of Testimonies the ^e first and ^f second epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians are expressly cited; and in ^g other works also passages of both these epistles are cited by Cyprian as words of the apostle Paul.

12. 'For ^h if the apostle Paul, writing to Timothy, said, *Let no man despise thy youth*, how much more may it be said to you by your colleagues, *Let no man despise thy age*:' 1 Tim. iv. 12.

13. 'Therefore ⁱ the apostle Paul writes to Timothy, and directs, *That a bishop should not strive, but be gentle, and apt to teach*;' 2 Tim. ii. 24.

14. In the books of Testimonies ^k these two epistles are quoted by Cyprian distinctly, as the first and second to Timothy.

15. In the third book of Testimonies: 'To ^l Titus, [that is, in the epistle to Titus, as appears from what there precedes:] *A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that such an one is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself*:' Tit. iii. 10, 11. In a synodical epistle of Cyprian, and other bishops in Africa, sent to some of their brethren in Spain;

** Vid. Wolff. Curæ in Ep. ad Philip. cap. 1. 6. . . . 8.

^b Cujus rei memor beatus apostolus Paulus in epistola sua ponit et dicit: Mihi vivere Christus, et mori lucrum. De mortal. p. 158.

^c In epistola Pauli ad Colossenses: Instate orationi, vigilantes in ea. Test. l. iii. cap. 120.

^d Item beatus apostolus Paulus plenus Spiritu Sancto et vocandis forniculisque gentibus missus contestetur et instruat, dicens: videte ne quis vos deprædetur, . . . quia in ipso habitat omnis plenitudo divinitatis. De bono Patient. p.

210. ^e Test. l. iii. cap. 88. ^f Test.

l. iii. cap. 68. ^g De mort p. 164. Ep.

14. [al. 5.] p. 32. ^h Nam si apostolus

Paulus, ad Timotheum scribens, dixit: Juventutem tuam nemo despiciat: &c. Ep. 3. [al. 65.] p. 6. ⁱ Cui rei prospiciens

beatus Paulus apostolus ad Timotheum scribit et monet, episcopum non litigiosum, sed mitem et docibilem esse debere. Ep. 74. p. 215. ^k Testim. lib. iii. cap. 67.

76. 77. et passim. ^l Ad Titum: Hæreticum hominem post unam aut secundam, &c. Test. l. iii. c. 78.

‘Forasmuch^m as the apostle directs, that a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God.’ Tit. i. 7.

Mr. Hallett, in hisⁿ learned Discourse of Heresy and Schism, explaining the forecited difficult text to Titus, expresseth himself in this manner; ‘What I take to be the true interpretation of the character, *self-condemned*, has been often published, and yet has been strangely overlooked of late years. The oldest writer that I have found it in is Jerom, who in his comment upon the place says; “A heretic is said to be condemned of himself, because (while a fornicator, an adulterer, a murderer, and other vicious persons, are cast out of the church by the priests) heretics pass sentence upon themselves, and of their own accord depart from the church; which departure is as a condemnation passed on them by their own consciences.” And Mr. Hallett there shews that this has been the opinion of divers learned moderns, particularly of Estius, bishop Barlow, and Dr. Hammond.

I shall here add a passage from Cyprian, which may shew that interpretation to be older than Jerom; as Mr. Hallett likewise supposes, for he takes it to be the true meaning of the text. ‘Which,’ says^o Cyprian, ‘the apostle Paul confirms, when he teaches and requires that a heretic be rejected, as being subverted, a sinner, and condemned of himself: for the ruin of such an one must be laid to his own charge, who is not cast out by the bishop, but of his own accord forsakes the church, passing sentence upon himself by his heretical presumption.’

16. The epistle to Philemon is not found quoted in the remaining works of Cyprian. The shortness of it may be supposed to be the reason.

VI. The epistle to the Hebrews is no where expressly quoted by St. Cyprian; nor are there in his works any passages that contain allusions to it. He may have some texts of the Old Testament which are cited, or alluded to, in the epistle to the Hebrews; but he does not take them from that epistle, but from the original books themselves. This is so plain, that I suppose

^m . . . quando et apostolus moneat ac dicat: Episcopum oportet esse sine crimine, quasi Dei dispensatorem. Ep. 67. [al. 68.] p. 173.

ⁿ See Mr. Hallett’s Notes and Discourses, Vol. iii. p. 377, &c

^o Quisquis autem de collectis foras exierit, id est, si quis quamvis in ecclesia gratiam consecutus, recesserit, et ab ecclesia exierit, reum sibi futurum, id est, ipsum

sibi quod pereat imputaturum. Quod apostolus Paulus explanat, docens et precipiens hæreticum vitandum esse, ut perversum, et peccatorem, et a semetipso damnatum. Hic enim reus sibi erit, qui non ab episcopo eiectus, sed sponte de ecclesia profugus, et hæretica præsumptione a semetipso damnatus. Ep. 69. [al. 76.] p. 182.

p. 821.

no one will contest it. Dr. Mill ^p allows that this epistle is nowhere cited by St. Cyprian; and his not quoting this epistle, which is so large, in any of his tracts or epistles, may be reckoned an argument that he was not acquainted with it, or that he did not esteem it a part of holy scripture. Accordingly, Mr. Hallett, ^q in the introduction to his Paraphrase and Notes on the three last chapters of the epistle to the Hebrews, admits it to be very likely that St. Cyprian was of the same opinion with some others of the Latin church at that time, who did not receive this as a canonical epistle.

And indeed, that this Latin father did not reckon the epistle to the Hebrews to have been written by the apostle Paul, is farther evident from an observation twice mentioned by him, concerning the number of churches to which that apostle had written. In the first book of Testimonies, ^r 'Cyprian having quoted the words of Hannah, *the barren has born seven, and she that has many sons [or children] is waxed feeble*, (1 Sam. ii. 5.) goes on: The seven sons are seven churches; for which reason Paul wrote to seven churches; and the Revelation has seven churches, that the number seven may be preserved.' In another tract, having mentioned the seven golden candlesticks in the Revelation, the seven pillars in Solomon's Proverbs, upon which Wisdom built her house, and likewise the forementioned seven in the first book of Samuel, and the seven women in Is. iv. 1. he adds; 'And ^s the apostle Paul, who was mindful of this authorized and well-known number, writes to seven churches; and in the Revelation our Lord sends his divine and heavenly instructions and commands to seven churches and their angels.' By the seven churches, to which Paul wrote, Cyprian unquestionably meaneth the churches of Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, and Thessalonica; as is also observed by bishop Fell ^u in a note upon this passage.

Nevertheless, that learned writer adds there a remark which appears to me very particular: 'If it be asked,' says he, 'in

^r Tertullianum nescio an secutus sit Cyprianus; in cuius operibus epistolam hanc [ad Hebræos] nunquam citatam reperiri. Prol. n. 216. ^q See introd. p. 211. ^s Item in Basileion primo: *Sterilis peperit, et quæ plurimos habebat filios, infirmata est. Filii autem septem sunt ecclesie septem.* Unde et Paulus septem ecclesiis scribit, et Apocalypsis ecclesias septem ponit, at servetur septenarius numerus. Test. l. i. cap. 20. ^u Et apostolus Paulus, qui huius numeri legitimi et

certi meminit, ad septem ecclesias scribit. Et in Apocalypsi Dominus mandata sua divina et præcepta cœlestia ad septem ecclesias et earum angelos scribit. De exhort. Mart. cap. 11. p. 179. ^u Ad septem ecclesias scribit.] Nimirum ad Romanos, Corinthios, Galatas, Ephesios, Philippenses, Colossenses, et Thessalonicenses. Si requiratur, quo in loco Paulus huius legitimi et certi numeri meminerit, forte dicendum, hoc ab eo præstitum. Hebr. xi. 30.

' what

‘ what place Paul has mentioned [so he understands the word ‘ meminit] this authorised and well-known number, perhaps ‘ it must be said, that it is done by him in Hebr. xi. 30. By ‘ *faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were compassed about ‘ seven days.*’ But I suppose it can scarce be doubted but Cyprian’s meaning is, that as a regard had been had to the number seven by many persons upon various occasions; so likewise Paul had remembered, *was mindful of*, shewed his respect to that number by writing epistles to seven churches, and no more.

From these passages then it may be reckoned evident, that Cyprian supposed the apostle Paul had written to no more than seven churches, and that his other epistles were sent to particular persons. Cyprian therefore did not compute the epistle to the Hebrews among the works of the apostle Paul.

Since the writing what is above, relating to this epistle to the Hebrews, I have had an opportunity to consult Mr. Marshall’s English translation of St. Cyprian. The passage of our author last cited is there rendered after this manner: ‘ Thus ^w the ‘ apostle St. Paul, bearing in his mind this remarkable and distinguished number, hath written precisely to seven churches. ‘ And in the Revelation our blessed Lord directs his heavenly ‘ instructions to seven churches and their seven angels.’ And in the notes upon this place, Mr. Marshall omits the above-mentioned remark of bishop Fell, which I have taken the liberty to censure, without translating it, or saying any thing about it. He likewise adds another remark of his own, which is much better, in these very words; ‘ So that our author, (I observe) did not ‘ ascribe the Hebrews to St. Paul.’

Here therefore it will be very proper to take notice of Mr. Marshall’s translation of a passage in St. Cyprian’s works. It is in the Acts of the council at Carthage in the year 256, where our bishop presided. There a part of the thirty-third suffrage, that of Felix of Amaccora, is thus rendered; ‘ Wherefore to ‘ me it is manifest, that neither heretics nor schismatics are capable of the *heavenly gift*, who have been so presumptuous as ‘ to expect it from men who are sinners and aliens from the ‘ church.’ Here that expression, *heavenly gift*, seems to be taken from Hebr. vi. 4. but there is no such expression in the original Latin. Felix says, that ^x heretics and schismatics are not capable of *any thing heavenly*; that is, spiritual or divine. This

^w See Mr. N. Marshall’s St. Cyprian. p. 179. ^x Et ideo manifestum est, nec hereticos nec schismaticos aliquid celeste

posse suscipere, qui a peccatoribus hominibus, et ab ecclesia extraneis audeant accipere. ap. Cypr. p. 236.

wrong version seems to be owing to the liberty which Mr. Marshall gave himself, and which I observed (L) formerly. He says in his ¹ preface, 'I have here and there also expressed my author's sense in the language of holy scripture, where he himself did not mean to quote it: but then, in such cases, I never refer to the passage, as I always do where he particularly cites any verse or chapter of the inspired writers.' But yet here Mr. Marshall has not only expressed his author's sense in the language of the epistle to the Hebrews, 'where he himself did not mean to quote it,' but he has also marked and distinguished this expression by putting it in the body of his translation in Italic letters, and by referring in the margin to the epistle to the Hebrews, and also by putting this reference or quotation at the end of the volume in the table of the texts of scripture cited by St. Cyprian. To what shall we ascribe this? I conceive of this matter thus: In translating this ² *suffrage*, Mr. Marshall put in practice the liberty we have noted: he then, at first, wrote out that passage without any distinction of letters, and without any marginal reference to a book of holy scripture; but some good while after, when he came to review and read over his version, and no longer had the original before him, seeing this expression, he thought it worthy of observation; and therefore presently marked it with his pen for Italic, and put a reference in the margin, whence it came also into the table of texts at the end of the volume. This, I think, is a likely way of accounting for this matter: however, it may be partly accounted for another way; for the marking that expression for Italic, the marginal reference, and it's place in the table of texts, may be all owing to some person employed under Mr. Marshall. But still the translator is accountable for all that ensued upon his wrong translation: and if Mr. Marshall was not deceived and misled by his own version, some one else very near him was imposed upon; and in like manner must all others be deceived who read this passage in his translation, and have no opportunity of consulting the original.

VII. I shall now observe this writer's testimony to the catholic epistles.

1. We find no quotations or allusions to the epistle of St. James in St. Cyprian's works.

2. The apostle Peter's first epistle is often quoted by St. Cyprian. 'Likewise ^a Peter, upon whom by the gracious vouch-

(1) See before, p. 145. Note (D)
p. xviii. * Item Petrus, super quem
ecclesia Domini dignatione fundata est, in

epistola sua ponit et dicit: Christus passus
est pro nobis, relinquens vobis exemplum,
ut sequamini vestigia ejus: qui peccatum

safement,

‘safement of the Lord the church is built, says in his epistle, (1 Pet. ii. 21, 22, 23.) *Christ suffered for us, leaving you an example, that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed [or yielded] himself to him that judged him unrighteously:*’ meaning Pontius Pilate. So Cyprian must have read this text, it being quoted by him after the same manner likewise in the ^b books of Testimonies. I may not stay to consider which reading is preferable, whether this, or that now more commonly received, *to him that judgeth righteously*: I would therefore refer my readers, for farther satisfaction, to ^c Mr. Wolff’s notes upon the place.

This epistle is several times quoted in the third book of Testimonies with this title, The ^d epistle of Peter to the people of Pontus: who are the persons first named in the inscription of the epistle.

In his other works, Cyprian quotes this as ^e the epistle of the apostle Peter, and ^f of Peter the apostle of Christ.

3. The second epistle of St. Peter is not at all quoted by Cyprian. One may be well apt to think it was not received by him as a sacred book; otherwise it could not have been omitted by a writer whose works so much abound with citations of scripture, and who had such controversies about the treatment of heretics. If this epistle had been a part of Cyprian’s canon, it is likely he would have applied divers passages of it to the heretics and schismatics of his own time, as he does (M) the texts of St. John’s first epistle relating to antichrist.

This may well bring to our mind the (N) passage formerly cited out of Firmilian’s letter to our author, where we were willing to suppose that Firmilian had a reference to St. Peter’s second epistle. Nevertheless, perhaps Cyprian’s entire silence about this epistle may induce some to doubt whether Firmilian did really refer to it. Farther, the entire silence of Cyprian, and the very small notice taken of this epistle by (O) Origen, another acquaintance, and a very intimate friend of Firmilian, may oc-

non fecit, nec dolus inventus est in ore ejus; qui cum malediceretur, non maledicebat; cum pateretur, non comminabatur, tradebat autem se judicante iniuste. De Bono Pat. p. 213, 214.

^b tradebat autem se judicanti iniuste. Test. l. iii. cap. 39.

^c Vid. Joh. Chr. Wolff. Cur. Philolog. et Crit. Tom. v. p. 122, 123.

^d De hoc ipso in epistola Petri ad Ponticos. Test. l. iii. c. 36. vid. et c. 37. 39.

^e Secundum quod Petrus apostolus in epistola sua pramonet et docet, dicens: Sobrii estote, &c. De Zel. et Livore p. 221.

^f Petrus etiam apostolus ejus docuerit, ideo persecutiones fieri, ut probemur: . . . posuit enim in epistola sua dicens: Ep. 58. al. 56. p. 121. (M) See below 4. note

^k and num. 10. (N) Vol. iii. ch. 39. num. 14. (O) See ch. 38. num. 12.

caſion

p. 831.

casion a doubt, whether this second epistle was received by Firmilian as an epistle of Peter.

I have no desire to set aside our second epistle of Peter, as not genuine; but I think it incumbent upon me to mention such observations as these when they offer: and I must still proceed to observe, that we have Firmilian's letter to Cyprian in a Latin translation only; nor do we certainly know by whom it was made. The expressions in the translation are very strong; that Peter and Paul in their epistles have cursed, or pronounced censures upon heretics, and admonished us to avoid them: but perhaps the words of the original were not so express. What we now have rendered *their epistles*, possibly might be only some general word denoting writings, or the scriptures: and in what Firmilian says of Peter, he might refer to that apostle's censure of Simon Magus, reputed an arch heretic, and recorded in ^h the Acts of the apostles; a book of holy scripture, and universally received. It is certain, that it is no uncommon thing for ancient Christian authors to quote Peter and Paul, meaning some words of theirs recorded in the Acts of the apostles, without naming that book, or hinting where the intended passage is to be found. We shall see in the * * next chapter a remarkable instance of this kind, where the apostle Paul is quoted. I place here †† in the margin several such quotations of the apostle Peter in divers authors, one of which contains a part of his reproof of the fore-mentioned Simon.

4. The first epistle of St. John is often expressly quoted by Cyprian: 'And ⁱ the apostle John, mindful of the command, writes in his epistle: *Hereby, says he, we perceive that we know him, if we keep his commandments: He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him:*' 1 John ii. 3.

4. I shall add one passage more ^k in the margin, where this epistle is quoted as written by the blessed apostle John.

^g Ex. gr. ταῖς γραφαῖς, τοῖς γραμμασιν.

^h Acts viii. 20. . . . 23. * * See below, chap. XLV. numb. vii. 7.

†† Et apostolus Petrus de salvatore testatus est, dicens: Hujus anima non derelicta est in inferno, nec caro ejus vidit corruptionem. [Vid. Act. ii. 27.] Philastr. de Hær. n. 69 158, Ed. Fabric. Et Petrus apostolus Mago Simoni dixerat: Age Penitentiam, si quo modo dimittatur tibi quod fecisti. [Vid. Act. viii. 22.] Philast. Hær. 82. p. 159. Adtende enim, quid Petrus apostolus Spiritu Sancto docente commo-
neat. qui ait: Et nunc ergo vos quid tenta-

tis Deum, imponere jugum collo discenti-um, &c. [Act. xv. 10. 11.] P. Oros. de lib. arb. p. 620. Ed. Havercamp. 1738. Sicut Petrus ad Judæos exclamavit: Dexteræ Dei exaltatus, acceptum a Patre Spiritum effudit, &c. [Act. ii. 33.] Victorin. in Apocal. ap. Bib. Patr. T. iii. R. 415. D.

ⁱ Et Joannes apostolus mandati memor in epistola sua postmodum ponit: in hoc, inquit, intelligimus quia cognovimus eum, si præcepta ejus custodiamus. . . . Ep. 28. [al. 25.] p. 54.

^k Item beatus Joannes apostolus nec ipse ullam hæresin, aut schisma discrevit, aut

There

There are two passages, where Cyprian is supposed by some to quote or refer to the disputed text, concerning the three witnesses in heaven. The first is to this purpose: 'The¹ Lord says, *I and the Father are one.* And again, of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit it is written: *And these three are one.*' 1 John v. 7. The other passage I shall not translate. However, I put it^m in the margin, for the sake of those who may chuse to see it here. I do not enter into the merits of the question, whether this clause be genuine, or whether it was quoted or referred to by St. Cyprian. The reader who is desirous of information concerning this matter, may consult theⁿ authors who have treated of it largely; but in a (p) following chapter will be found an argument of no small weight in favour of the supposition, that this clause was wanting in St. Cyprian's copies of St. John's epistle.

5. In a passage cited just now it is said, John writes in his epistle, meaning our first epistle of St. John: and it must be owned, that St. Cyprian has no where quoted any other epistle of this apostle. But this may be accounted for by the brevity of the two other epistles. It is certain, that form of quotation is no proof of his knowing, or owning no other epistle of St. John, the like form being also often used by him in quoting an epistle of St. Paul. There are some instances of this to be found in the passages already cited. I shall add here one more: 'And^o again the blessed apostle says in his epistle, (1 Cor. xii. 26.) *Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member rejoice, all the members rejoice with it.*' It is reasonable to suppose, that the second epistle of St. John was owned by Cyprian, because it is expressly cited by one of the bishops in the council of Carthage held in 256, of which Cyprian was a principal part. That bishop there delivers his opinion upon the point in debate

aliquos speciatim separatos posuit, sed universos qui de ecclesia exissent, quique contra ecclesiam facerent, antichristos appellavit, dicens: audistis quia antichristus venit. Nunc autem antichristi multi facti sunt, &c. [1 Joh. ii. 18. 19.] Ep. 69. [al. 76] p. 180.

¹ Dicit Dominus: Ego et Pater unum sumus. Et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est: Et hi tres unum sunt. De Unitate Ec. p. 109.

^m Nam si baptizari quis apud hæreticos potuit, utique et remissionem peccatorum consequi potuit. Si peccatorum remissionem consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est, quæro cuius Dei? Si creatoris, non potuit qui in eum non cre-

didit. Si Christi, nec hujus fieri potuit templum, qui negat Deum Christum. Si Spiritus Sancti, cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est? ad Jubaianum Ep. 73. p. 203.

ⁿ There may be seen a large collection of such authors in Mr. Wolff's *Cursus Philolog. &c.* in loc. Tom. iv. p. 293. &c. I therefore refer only to a very few. Vid. Mill. in loc. Emlyn's *Traacts*. Ri. Simon. *Hist. Crit. du Texte du Nou. Test.* ch. xvii. Le Clerc. *Bib. Univ. T. xii.* p. 450. . . . 455, et passim. and Mr. David Casley's *Preface to the Catalogue of the manuscripts of the king's library.*

p. 835.

in this manner: 'The ^p apostle John writes in his epistle, [that is, in one of his epistles] *If there come any unto you, and bring not the doctrine of Christ, receive him not into your house; neither bid him, God speed. For he that biddeth him, God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds:*' 2 John, 10, 11. And St. John's third epistle likewise may have been owned by Cyprian.

6. There is no notice taken of the epistle of St. Jude in the works of this writer.

VIII. The book of the Revelation is frequently quoted by Cyprian; but he has no where said that it was written by John the apostle, and but once mentioned the name of the writer. And, ⁹ in the Revelation, the angel, when John would have worshipped him, refused it, and said, *See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant and of thy brethren: worship the Lord Jesus.* So it is in Cyprian. We have it, *Worship God*, Rev. xxii. 9.

The Revelation was esteemed by him a book of authority, as is evident from the manner in which he quotes it. Recommending works of goodness, 'Hear, says ^r he, in the Revelation the voice of thy Lord justly reproving such men as these: *Thou sayest, says he, that I am rich and increased in goods, and have need of nothing: and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked:*' ch. iii. 17. 18. Again: 'So in the ^s holy scriptures, by which the Lord would have us to be instructed and warned, is the harlot city described.' He then cites Rev. xvii. 1. 2. 3. Once more: 'And ^t that waters signify people, the divine scripture shews in the Revelation:' ch. xvii. 15.

I may add here, that words of this book are cited together with other texts of the New Testament, in a letter of some presbyters and deacons, and others, confessors of the church of Rome, to Cyprian, written in 250. 'And, to ^u him that overcometh will I give to sit upon my throne, even as I also overcame, and am sat down upon my Father's throne:' Rev. iii. 21.

(p) See below chap. XLV. numb. vi.

10. 11. 12. ^o Et iterum posuit [beatus apostolus] in epistola sua dicens: Si putatur membrum unum, &c. Ep. 17. [al. 12.] p. 39.

^p Joannes apostolus in epistola sua posuit dicens: si quis ad vos venit, et doctrinam Christi non habet, nolite eum admittite in domum vestram, et ave illi ne dixeritis. Qui enim dixerit illi, ave, communicat factis ejus malis. Tract. p. 243.

^q Et in apocalypsi angelus Joanni volenti adorare se resistit et dicit: Vide ne feceris, quia conservus tuus sum et fratrum tuorum. Jesum Dominum

adora. De Bono Pudicitiae. p. 220.

^r Audi in apocalypsi Domini tui vocem, ejusmodi homines justis obiurgationibus increpantem: Dicis, inquit, dives sum, et ditatus sum, et nullius rei egeo. De Op. et Eleem. p. 202.

^s Sic in scripturis sanctis, quibus nos instrui dominus voluit et moneri, describitur civitas meretrix, compta pulchrius et ornata. De Habitu Virg. p. 97.

^t Aquas namque populos significare, in apocalypsi scriptura divina declarat, dicens: Aquae quas vidisti, &c. Ep. 63. p. 153.

^u Ep. 31. 31. [al. 26.] p. 62.

IX. St. Cyprian's respect for the scriptures of the New Testament appears, in his very numerous quotations of them, in his appeals to them as decisive in matters of dispute and controversy, and in divers forms of citation, particularly such as these: *The^w Lord says in the gospel; or in his gospel*, as in several of the passages cited above; *divine scriptures*, of the Acts; *sacred scriptures*, and *divine scriptures*, speaking of the Revelation; *the blessed apostle Paul, full of the grace of the inspiration of the Lord*; *the blessed apostle Paul, chosen and sent of the Lord*; *the blessed apostle Paul, full of the Holy Ghost, and sent to call and convert the Gentiles*; as we have seen already. Farther: 'The^x Holy Spirit, foretelling and forewarning us by the apostle, *In the last days*,' says he, '*perilous times shall come*,' 2 Tim. iii. 1. Again; 'Paul, y in his epistles, in which he forms us to a holy course of life by his divine instructions, says, (1 Cor. vi. 19. 20.) *Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a great price: glorify and carry God in your body*.' So Cyprian, z and some other ancient writers, read that text. In another place, 'The^a Holy Ghost forewarns by the apostle, and says, *There must be also heresies, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you*,' 1 Cor. xi. 19. Again; 'And^b therefore it is written; *Hold fast that which thou hast, that another take not thy crown*,' Rev. iii. 11. One of the bishops at the council of Carthage, in the year 256, says; 'I^c am of opinion that blasphemous and wicked heretics, who pervert the sacred and adorable words of the scriptures, ought to be accursed.' Afterwards another bishop, in the same assembly, says; 'I^d also, following the authority of the divine scriptures, am of opinion that heretics are to be baptised.' Cyprian^e earnestly exhorts all in general, but especially Christian ministers, in all doubtful

^w In evangelio Dominus loquitur, dicens: Qui confessus me fuerit coram hominibus, &c. De Baptis. p. 130.

^x Prænuntiante per apostolum nobis, et præmonente Spiritu Sancto: In novissimis, inquit, diebus aderunt tempora molesta. De Unit. Ec. p. 115. ^y Paulus in epistolis suis dicit, quibus nos ad curricula vivendi per divina magisteria formavit; Non estis vestri; empti enim estis pretio magno. Glorificate [al Clarificate] et portate Deum in corpore vestro. De Habit. Virg. p. 93. ^z Vid. Mill. in loc.

^a Per apostolum præmonet Spiritus Sanctus, et dicit: Oportet et hæreses esse. De Unit. Ec. p. 111. ^b Et ideo scriptum est: Tene quod habes, ne alius accipiat coronam tuam. De Unit. Ec. p. 117.

^c Hæreticos blasphemos et iniquos ver-

bis varriis decerpentes sancta et adorabilia scripturarum verba execrandos censeo. Num. 31. p. 236. ^d Et ipse secutus divinarum scripturarum auctoritatem baptizandos hæreticos esse censeo. ibid. num. 33. vid. et num. 37. p. 337. ^e Nam si ad divinæ traditionis caput et originem revertamur, cessat error humanus. . . . Si canalis aquam fluens, qui copiose prius et largitur profuebat, subito deficiat, nonne ad fontem pergatur. . . . ? Quod et nunc facere oportet; Dei sacerdotes præcepta divina servantes, ut si in aliquo nutaverit et vacillaverit veritas; ad originem Dominicam et evangelicam, et apostolicam traditionem revertamur et inde surgat actus nostri ratio, unde et ordo et origo surrexit. Ep. 74. p. 215.

matters

p. 840.

matters to have recourse to the gospels, and the epistles of the apostles, as to the fountain where may be found the true original doctrine of Christ. He begins his discourse on the Lord's prayer in this manner; 'The ^f precepts of the gospel, my beloved brethren, are to be considered as the lessons of God to us; as the foundations of our hope, and the supports of our faith; as spiritual consolations to us, shewing us the paths of righteousness, and setting us forward in the way of salvation: for, whilst with teachable and willing minds we receive upon earth the instructions conveyed to us, we are led on insensibly to the kingdom of (Q) heaven.'

The respect for the scriptures, particularly of the New Testament, appears in the public reading of them in the church. Cyprian, in two different letters, written in his retirement, gives his people an account of his having there ordained two persons, Aurelius and Celerinus, who were before confessors, to be readers. In the former of those two letters he relates the many sufferings of Aurelius, and gives him a great character: and then adds; 'That ^s he had deserved, though young, a higher degree in the clergy, but he thought it best that he should begin with the office of a reader. Nothing,' says he, 'can be more fit than that he, who has made a glorious confession of the Lord, should read publicly in the church; that he who has shewn himself willing to die a martyr should read the gospel of Christ, by which martyrs are formed; and that he should be advanced from the rack to the desk.' Of Celerinus he writes in the following letter; 'That ^h it was very fit and becoming that he who was already so illustrious in the world should be placed upon the pulpit, that is, the tribunal of the church; that be-

^f Evangelica præcepta, fratres dilectissimi, nihil sunt aliud quam magisteria divina, fundamenta ædificandæ spei, firmamenta corroborandæ fidei, nutrimenta fovendi cordis, gubernacula dirigendi itineris, præsidia obtinendæ salutis: quæ dum dociles credentium mentes in terris instruunt, ad cælestia regna perducunt. De Orat. Dom. p. 139. (Q) That passage I have put down, as translated by Mr. Marshall. ^s Merebatur talis clericæ ordinationis ultiores gradus et incrementa majora, non de annis suis, sed de meritis æstimandus. Sed interim placuit, ut ab officio lectionis incipiat; quia et nihil magis congruit voci, quæ Dominum gloriosa prædicatione confessa est, quam celebrandis divinis lectionibus personare; præter verba sublimia, quæ Christi martyrium prolucuta sunt, evangelium Christi le-

gere, unde martyres fiunt, ad pulpitum post catastam venire; illic fuisse conspicuum gentilium multitudini, hic a fratribus conspici; illic auditum esse cum miraculo circumstantis populi, hic cum gaudio fraternitatis audiri. Hunc igitur, fratres dilectissimi, a me et a collegis qui præsentibus aderant, ordinatum sciatis. Ep. 38, [al. 33] p. 75. ^h . . . illustrem, quid aliud quam super pulpitum, id est, super tribunal ecclesiæ oportebat imponi, ut loci altioris celsitate subnixus, et plebi universæ pro honoris sui claritate conspicuus, legat præcepta et evangelium Domini, quæ fortiter et fideliter sequitur? . . . Nihil est in quo magis confessor fratribus profigit, quam et dum evangelica lectio de ore ejus auditur, lectoris fidem quisquis audierit, imitetur. Ep. 39, [al. 34] p. 77.

‘ing conspicuous to the people he may read the precepts and ‘gospel of the Lord, which he faithfully and courageously ob- ‘serves and maintains:’ and more there to the like purpose in behalf of his fitness, as a confessor, for the office to which Cyprian had ordained him.

We have not remaining any sermons or homilies of our author: but it may be reckoned very likely that the scriptures, which were so much read in the church of Carthage by a person particularly appointed to that office, were also explained there by the bishop, sometimes at least; and that, from the portions of scripture publicly read in the assemblies of the faithful, he gave them exhortations to the practice of virtue. And there is a passage in Cyprian’s last letter to his clergy and people, which seems to put this matter out of question. He is there giving them some directions for their conduct in that time of persecution. ‘As ⁱ for you, my dearest brethren, I must charge ‘you to be quiet and peaceable, according to the command- ‘ments of the Lord, which I have frequently recommended to ‘you, and upon which you have very often heard me preach- ‘ing.’

X. I would now put down some general titles and divisions of the books of the New Testament which we find in this ancient writer: we shall at the same time observe more tokens of high esteem for them.

It is fit, however, that we should first take notice of his general division of all the scriptures received by Christians, which is ^k that of Old and New. The study of both these Cyprian recommends as very beneficial for confirming our virtue and increasing our knowledge; and he calls them the books of the Spirit, or inspired writings, the divine fountains, and fountains of the divine fulness. So he writes in his preface to his first two books of Testimonies.

The general titles and divisions of the New Scriptures are such as these: Cyprian himself, delivering his own sentiment in the forementioned council, says; ‘My ^l opinion is, that here-

ⁱ Vos autem, fratres carissimi, pro disciplina, quam de mandatis Dominicis a me semper accepistis, et secundum quod me tractante sapissime didicistis, quietem et tranquillitatem tenete, &c. Ep. 81, [al. 83] p. 239.

^k —quæ legenti tibi [al. legentibus] interim prosint ad prima fidei lineamenta formanda. Plus roboris [tibi] dabitur, et magis ac magis intellectus cordis operabitur scrutanti scripturas ve-

teres ac novas plenius, et universa librorum spiritualium volumina perlegenti. Nam nos nunc de divinis fontibus implevimus modicum, quod tibi interim mitteremus. Bibere et saturari copiosius poteris, si tu quoque ad eosdem divinæ plenitudinis fontes nobiscum pariter potaturus accesseris. p. 18.

^l Hæreticos secundum evangelicam et apostolicam confessionem adversarios Christi et antichristi-

‘tics,

'tics, which by the evangelic and apostolic authority are declared adversaries of Christ, and antichrists, when they come to the church, are to be baptized with the one only baptism of the church.' In another place ^m he observes what is written of obtaining remission of sins 'in the gospels and the epistles of the apostles.' Again; 'Whence,' says ⁿ he, 'is that tradition? Does it descend from the authority of the Lord and the gospels, or does it come from the commandments and epistles of the apostles? For those things ought to be done which are written, as God taught Joshua the son of Nun: Josh. i. 8. And soon after; 'If ^o therefore it is commanded in the gospel, or is contained in epistles or Acts, that they who come over from any herefy should not be baptized, but only have imposition of hands in order to penance, let that sacred and divine tradition be observed.' From this passage it may be argued, that the book of the Acts of the apostles was joined with the epistles, not with the gospels. We see plainly that this general division of the books of the New Testament very much obtained at that time: they were all contained in two codes, volumes, or general divisions; one called the Gospels, or scriptures of the Lord; the other the Apostle, or the epistles of the apostles; and in this later division was usually placed the book of the Acts of the apostles. I shall put ^p in the margin a few more examples of those two general titles from our author. We likewise see very clearly that in these two codes were included all the scriptures of the New Testament, which Christians esteemed divine, and received as the rule of faith and practice, to which all were bound to submit, and whose sacred and supreme authority was readily and cheerfully owned by all good Christians.

Nor were there any Christian books of authority beside the four gospels, the Acts, and epistles of apostles. It does hence

te appellatos, quando ad ecclesiam venerint, unico ecclesie baptismo baptizandos esse. p. 243.

^m Quod enim in evangelis et apostolorum epistolis Jesu Christi nomen insinuat ad remissionem peccatorum, non ita est quasi aut sine Patre, aut contra Patrem prodesse cuius solus Filius possit. Ep. 73, p. 205.

ⁿ Unde est ista traditio? utrumne de Dominica et evangelica auctoritate descendens, an de apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse quæ scripta sunt, Deus testatur et proponit ad Jesum Nave, dicens, &c. Ep. 74, p. 211.

^o Si ergo aut in evangelio præcipitur, aut in apostolorum epistolis aut Actibus continetur; . . . observetur divina hæc et sancta traditio. ibid.

^p Scias nos ab evangelicis et apostolis traditionibus non recedere. Ep. 4, [al. 62] p. 7. Prænuntiata sunt hæc futura in seculi fine; et Domini voce, atque apostolorum contestatione prædictum est: [Vid. Luc. xviii. 8. 2 Tim. iii. 1.] Ep. 67, [al. 68] p. 174. Nec episcopus computari potest, qui evangelica et apostolica traditione contempta, nemini succedens, a seipso ortus est. Ep. 69, [al. 76] p. 181.

clearly appear that no epistles or other doctrinal writings of any person, who was of a rank below that of an apostle, were received by Christians as a part of their rule of faith. There are in Cyprian's works very numerous citations of the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, the thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul, (excepting only that to Philemon) the first epistle of the apostle Peter, the first epistle of the apostle John, and the Revelation, which it is highly probable he believed to be written by John the apostle: and all these are quoted as writings of authority. But in all the works of Cyprian there is not any one such citation of any other Christian book or author. It is therefore manifest that the writings or scriptures above-named were of authority, and that no writings of Christians, nor apostles, were esteemed to be so, except the historical writings of Mark and Luke. I inculcate this observation upon my readers: I think it is founded upon good evidence; and I believe it will appear to be of signal use and great importance.

XI. Nor have I observed in Cyprian any quotations of spurious apocryphal Christian writings. Mr. Jones⁹ indeed, in his Alphabetical Table of apocryphal pieces not extant, mentions a book under the name of Paul. See Cypr. Ep. 23. But that book is really nothing but a note of Paul, a martyr of Cyprian's own time, containing a kind of absolution of some one or more persons who had lapsed in the Decian persecution, and forged by one Lucian, as appears from (*) Cyprian's complaints about that matter. Mr. Jones afterwards perceived this mistake, and acknowledged it somewhere, as I well remember, though the place does not now offer itself to me.

XII. Nevertheless, Cyprian often quotes apocryphal books of the Old Testament; such as Tobit, the book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, two books of Maccabees, and others, and in terms of high respect: for instance, quoting the book of Wisdom he^r says, *the Holy Spirit therein teaches us*. And^s the book of Tobit is quoted by him as divine scripture: but yet I do not think those citations prove that Cyprian esteemed these books to be of authority. It is not difficult for the reader to recollect some

⁹ See Mr. Jones's New and full method, &c. Vol. i. p. 148.

(*) Nam fratre nostro Luciano, et ipse unus de confessionibus, fide quidem calidus et virtute robustus, sed minus Dominica lectione fundatus, quaedam conatus est, imperiti jampridem se vulgi auctorem constitutens, ut manu eius scripti libelli gregatim multis nomine Pauli darentur. Cypr. Ep.

27. [al. 23] p. 52. ^r Per Solomonem Spiritus Sanctus ostendit et præcavit, dicens: Et si coram hominibus tormenta passi sunt, spes eorum immortalitate plena est. [Sap. iii. 4.] Cypr. De Exhort. Mart. cap. 12. p. 182. ^s Et ideo scriptura divina instruit, dicens: bona est oratio cum jejuniis et elemosyna. [Tob. xii. 9.] De Or. Dom. p. 153.

p. 849.

things to this purpose already alleged from Greek writers, and our observations upon them: so Origen (R) often quotes the Shepherd of Hermas as an useful book, as scripture, and divinely inspired: but yet he did not suppose passages alleged thence to be decisive proofs, or evidences of any doctrine. There was allowed to these writers some degree and measure of inspiration, but not that fulness of the Spirit, or that high degree of inspiration, which was afforded to the prophets of the Old Testament, and the apostles of the New. It seems very evident, from the catalogue of the books of the Old Testament left us by (s) Melito, bishop of Sardis, about the year 170, that none of the books we now call apocryphal had a place in it. The (r) catalogue of the Jewish sacred books found in Origen's works has a great agreement with Melito's. It appears from what we have observed from (v) Africanus, and (x) Origen, that it was generally well known among Christians, of the eastern part of the world at least, that the scriptures of the Old Testament, or Jewish canon, were written in Hebrew; and that the books we now call apocryphal were not written in Hebrew, but in Greek; and that they were not received by the Jews as a part of their sacred scriptures. And that the Latin Christians, who lived in the western part of the Roman empire, had for the most part the like knowledge and sentiments upon this point with those in the east, may be argued from Rufinus, and Jerom; not to insist now upon any others. Rufinus, as (A) formerly cited, assures us that there were some books, not reckoned canonical, but called by the ancients ecclesiastical: and of this last sort he says were the books called the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees. He adds, that ^t these were read in the churches, but no article of faith was to be taken from them: and he delivers this as the ancient belief of Christians. Jerom writes to the like purpose. He says that ^u the book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, and the Mac-

(R) See Vol. ii. ch. 38. num. xxiii.

(s) See Vol. ii. p. 146, and Euseb. H. B. iv. 26.

(r) See Vol. ii. ch. 38. num. xxvi.

(v) Vol. ii. ch. 37. num. v.

(x) Vol. ii. ch. 38. num. xxv. (A) Ib. num. xxiii. 2. fin.

^t . . . quæ omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Cæteras vero scripturas apocryphas nominarunt, quas in ecclesiis legi nonauerunt. Hæc nobis a patribus, ut dixi, tradita opportunum visum est hoc in loco designare, ad instructionem eorum

qui prima sibi ecclesiæ ac fidei elementa suscipiunt. Rufin. in Symb.

^u Hic prologus scripturarum, quasi galeatum principium omnibus libris, quos de Hebræo vertimus in Latinum, convenire potest: ut scire valeamus quicquid extra hoc est, inter *apocrypha* esse ponendum. Igitur Sapientia, quæ vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, et Jesu filii Syrach liber, Judith, et Tobias, et Pastor, non sunt in Canone. Præf. Hieron de omnib. libr. V. T. Seu Præf. in libr. Reg.

cabees, are not in the canon, but are to be reputed apocryphal. In ^w another place he says again expressly, that the church reads Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees, but does not receive them as canonical scriptures. These, he adds, and the book of Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus likewise, may be read for the edification of the people, but no doctrine of religion can be proved by their authority. So write these two learned authors of the fourth century. And that Cyprian was exactly of the same judgment upon this point, may be argued from a passage (B) cited above; where, having quoted the book of Tobit, he shews that he did not desire the text alleged thence should be taken as a decisive proof of what he advanceth; and adds, that he should confirm what was said there by the testimony of truth, meaning the Acts of the apostles: which is enough to satisfy us that he really made a distinction, and that this distinction was well known, though it is not often expressly mentioned. Those books therefore of the Old Testament, which we call apocryphal, were quoted by way of illustration, but not as of authority, or alone decisive in any point of doctrine, unless confirmed by the inspiration of prophets or apostles. Mr. Marshall, in his notes upon St. Cyprian, has divers useful remarks (c) upon the citations of the apocryphal scriptures found in our author.

XIII. We have now seen in St. Cyprian a large canon of scripture; all the books of the New Testament commonly received by Christians at this present time, except the epistle to Philemon, (which may have been omitted for no other reason but that he had no particular occasion to quote it;) and the epistle to the Hebrews, and the epistle of St. James, and the second epistle of St. Peter, and the epistle of St. Jude. There is no particular citation of the third epistle of St. John; but, considering its shortness, and that the other two epistles of that apostle are expressly mentioned, there seems not to be any good reason for supposing it to have been rejected by this writer, or unknown to him. Excepting these few, all the other books of the New Testament have an ample testimony given them in the works of St. Cyprian; and they appear to have been esteemed inspired books, and writings of authority, the rule of faith and

^w Sicut ergo Judith et Tobit, et Maccabæorum libros legit quidem ecclesia, sed inter canonicas scripturas non recipit: sic et hæc duo volumina legat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum; dogmatum confirmandam, Ejusd.

Præf. in Libr. Salom. ad Chrom. et Hierod. (B) See p. 151. (c) See the title of apocryphal writings, &c. in the Table of matters, at the end of Mr. Marshall's St. Cyprian.

p. 855.

practice to all Christian people. Nor is there in this eminent and celebrated African bishop of the third century one quotation of any Christian spurious, or apocryphal scriptures.

C H A P XLV.

Writings ascribed to St. CYPRIAN, or joined with his works.

I. *Pontius*. II. *An anonymous author concerning heretics*. III. *Anonymous author concerning discipline and the benefit of chastity*. IV. *Anonymous author of the praise of martyrdom*. V. *Anonymous author against the Novatian heretic*. VI. *Anonymous author concerning rebaptizing; or, of the baptism of heretics*. VII. *Anonymous author of a computation of Easter*.

I. I HAVE several times quoted The Life of St. Cyprian, written by his deacon Pontius, which is now usually prefixed to the works of that father. St. Jerom^a calls it an excellent performance. Rigaltius^b will scarce allow that it deserves to be reckoned a history, it is so defective and so rhetorical; it is however useful: and if Pontius was not a fine writer, he was a good man. We have no reason to question his being worthy of the confidence and friendship with which that eminent bishop honoured him. He triumphed in^c Cyprian's glorious martyrdom, though at the same time he was not a little grieved that he did not accompany him. He is said to have died a martyr himself; but there is scarce any good authority for that supposition. St. Jerom says nothing of it; nor has he mentioned any work of his, beside this one of Cyprian's Life and Passion, as he expressly calls it. This writer is placed by Cave at the year 251.

^a Pontius, diaconus Cypriani, usque ad diem passionis ejus cum ipso exilium sustinens, egregium volumen vitæ et passionis Cypriani reliquit. De V. I. cap. 68.

^b Vita Cypriani quæ fertur ab ejus diacono Pontio perscripta rhetoricæ dictionis gratiam magis quam narrationis historicæ diligentiam præfert. Rigalt. Not. ad Cypr. Ep. 81, [al. 83] ed. Oxon. p. 238.

^c Inter gaudium passionis, et remanendi dolorem, in partes divisus animus, et angustum nimis pectus affectus duplices onerant. Dolebo, quod non comes fuerim? Sed illius victoria triumphanda est. De victoria triumphabo? Sed doleo, quod comes non sim? . . . Multum, et nimis multum de gloria ejus exulto: plus tamen doleo, quod remansi. Pont. in fine.

Trithemius says that ^d Pontius converted the two Philips, emperors of Rome, to the faith of Christ: but ^e it is thought that he confounds our Pontius, deacon of Cyprian and an African, with another of this name in Gaul, who is said to have suffered martyrdom ^f in the time of Valerian and Gallienus; of whom there are ^g Acts of martyrdom still extant, where that story is related: but ^h Pagi has shewn that those Acts are not to be relied upon in that matter, as being the forgery of a late writer. And Tillemont ⁱ has been at the pains to demonstrate at large that they are good for nothing

Pontius, in his Life of Cyprian, has quoted the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, the ^k first chapter in particular, and St. John, and several of St. Paul's epistles, and the book of the Acts of the apostles ^l expressly by that title. There is no necessity to be more particular here, since it may be relied upon, and taken for granted, that this deacon's canon was the same with his bishop's.

II. There are several treatises, which sometimes have been ascribed to St. Cyprian, but are now generally allowed by learned men not to be his. I shall here speak of four of them: Of shews; Of discipline and the benefit of chastity; Of the praise of martyrdom; Against the heretic Novatian, or, Against the Novatian heretic. Of the first two, and the last, Du Pin ^m says, they are ancient and useful; that they appear to have been all three written by one and the same person, and that they might be reckoned pieces of St. Cyprian, if it were not for the difference of style; and that they are not ascribed to him in the manuscripts, but only in the printed editions. As I do not see any plain marks of these three pieces having one and the same author, I shall give a distinct account of all the four treatises just mentioned, according to the order they are placed in above, which is the same they have in the appendix to St. Cyprian's genuine works in the Oxford edition. Afterwards I shall make some extracts out of the book of an anonymous author, Concerning the rebaptizing of heretics: and lastly, out of a small piece,

^d Hic Pontius sua melliflua predicatione et industria duos Philippos imperatores ad Christum convertit, &c. Trithem. de Scr. Ec. cap. 42. p. 14. Ed. Fabr.

^e Vid. Fabric. ib. not. m. ^f Vid. Baron. Ann. 246. n. 9. Tillem. Persecution de l'église sous l'empereur Valerien. Art. 7. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. i. p. 26, 27. Acta S. S. per Bolland. &c. ad diem 14 Maii. Ruinart. Act. Mart. p. 215, not. 62.

^g Ap. Baluz. Miscell. l. ii. p. 124. &c.

^h Pagi Crit. in Bar. 244. n. 6.

ⁱ Not. 7. sur la persecution de Valerien. p. 336. 340. M. E. T. iv. P. i.

^k Sane et in scripturis tale aliquid invenio. Nam Zacharias sacerdos, promisso sibi per angelum filio, quia non crediderat, obmutuit: [Luc. i. 20 et 64.] Pont. p. 8.

^l Sed etsi in apostolorum Actis eunuchus ille describitur, quia toto corde crediderat, a Philippo statim tinctus, non est similis comparatio. Ibid. p. 2.

^m S. Cyprien. Bibl. des Aut. Ecc. T. i. p. 172.

entitled,

entitled, a Computation of Easter; all these being now usually joined in the volume of St. Cyprian's works.

1. I begin ^b with the piece, Of shews, which is called an epistle of an unknown author. It seems to have been written by a bishop, then ⁱ unwillingly separated from his people, and who had not frequent opportunities of writing to them. Tillemont ^k says that, whoever was the author, it is an excellent work: that ^l it was written in the times of heathenism, when ^m exorcisms were frequent in the church, and ⁿ whilst it was yet the custom to carry the eucharist home. That it was written in the time of heathenism, I think apparent from divers passages. This book is much commended by the ^o Benedictine, who writes the life of St. Cyprian; but yet he does not allow it to be his: for though it has in it those marks of antiquity which have been observed by Tillemont, and though among the works ascribed to Cyprian; none resemble his style more than this, there is no notice at all taken of it by Pontius, and there is in it a difference of style, which may be perceived by all who are well acquainted with Cyprian's works.

2. In this book there are few texts of scripture quoted; which is different from Cyprian's ordinary method, whose works abound with them. However, the author informs us that ^p some at that time endeavoured to defend their practice of frequenting the theatre, by the apostle's allusions to the heathen games, referring particularly to 1 Cor. ix. 25, and Eph. vi. 12: he is likewise supposed to refer to ^q Matt. xxvii. 52. He calls the scriptures of the New Testament ^r sacred writings, and ^s divine scriptures, and ^t heavenly scriptures. He also shews his respect for these books by his indignation against those, who ^u pretended to jus-

^b De Spectaculis. Epistola ignoti auctoris. ⁱ Ut me satis contristat, et animam meum graviter affligit, cum nulla mihi scribendi ad vos porrigitur occasio, (detrimentum enim est meum vobiscum non colloqui,) ita nihil mihi tantam letitiam hilaritatemque restituit, quam cum adest rursus occasio. p. 2. ed. Ox.

^k Mem. Ec. l. iv. St. Cyprien. art. 22. See also note xxviii. ^l Quod enim spectaculum sine idolo? quis ludus sine sacrificio? quod certamen non consecratum mortuo? p. 3. a. vid. quæ sequuntur.

^m Impu enter in ecclesia daemonia exoritur, quorum voluptates in spectaculis laudat. p. 3. a. ⁿ Qui festinans ad spectaculum, dimissus, et adhuc gerens secum, ut adest, eucharistiam inter corpora ob-

scena meretricium tulit. p. 3. b. m.

^o Vit. S. Cypri. § xxxv. ^p Apostolus quoque dimicans cestus et dimicationis nostræ adversus spiritualia nequitiae proponit certamen. Rursus de studiis sumit exempla, coronæ quoque collocat præmia. Cur ergo homini Christiano fidei non liceat spectare quod licuit divinis literis scribere? p. 2. b. in. ^q Considerabit etiam de sepulchris admirabiles iptorum consummatorum iam vitas corporum redactas: [consummatorum iam ad vitam corporum (animas) reductas. Baluz. p. 343.] p. 4. b. fin. ^r Prescribat igitur istis pudor, etiam si non possunt sanctæ literæ. p. 2. b. f. ^s Vid. supra p. ^t See the next note. ^u ... tamen, quoniam non desunt vitiorum assertores blandi et indul-

• tify

tify their frequenting the public shews by the authority of the heavenly scriptures. And at the end of his book, or letter, he recommends to Christians, instead of attending the theatre, the study of the scriptures, after this manner; 'I^w say then, that a good Christian ought to employ himself in diligent reading the sacred scriptures; there he will find more worthy objects for the entertainment of his faith and hope.'

3. So far of this book, which, though short, ought not to be reckoned unprofitable to us; and I hope it appears to deserve the account I have here given of it.

III. The second piece ascribed by some to Cyprian is entitled, Of ^{*} discipline and the benefit of chastity: in the Oxford and Benedictine editions it is called an epistle of an unknown author: the time of it too is uncertain: it is evident from the beginning of it that it was written by a bishop: I shall transcribe ^y the words by and by. The learned Benedictine beforementioned says this ^z piece is very ancient, and not unworthy of Cyprian himself; but the difference of style, and silence of Pontius about it, are good reasons why it ought not to be reckoned the work of that father. Whoever was the author, he has cited the words of divers books of the New Testament.

1. 'This,' says ^a he, 'our Lord taught, when he said, that a wife ought not to be divorced, *saving for the cause of adultery.*' Matth. v. 32.

2. 'Hence he [the apostle] says ^b also, that *the members of Christ ought not to be joined to the members of an harlot . . . hence deservedly adulterers do not inherit the kingdom of God.*' 1 Cor. vi. 15 and 9.

3. 'The ^c apostle declares the church to be the *spouse of Christ.*' See 2 Cor. xi. 2.

4. 'Hence ^d also the apostle has observed that *the man is the head of the woman,* [1 Cor. xi. 3; Eph. v. 23.] Nevertheless he

gentes patroni, qui præstant vitiis auctoritatem, et, quod est deterius, censuram scripturarum cœlestium in advocationem criminum convertunt, . . . Non pudet, non pudet, inquam, fideles homines et Christiani sibi nominis auctoritatem vindicantes, superstitiones vanas gentilium cum spectaculis mixtas de scripturis cœlestibus vindicare, et divinam auctoritatem idololatriæ conferre, . . . Hoc in loco non immerito dixerim, longe melius fuisse iustis nullas literas nosse, quam sic literas legere. p. 2. a. b. ed. Ox. Conf. ed. Baluz. p. 339. ^w Scripturis, inquam, sacris incumbat Christianus fidelis, et ibi inveniet condigna fidei spectacula, . . . Quam hoc

decorum spectaculum fratres, quam jucundum, quam necessarium! intueri semper spem suam, et oculos aperire ad salutem suam. p. 4. b. fin. ^z De Disciplina et bono Pudicitiae. ^y See below numb.

vi. ^z Ubi supra. § 35. p. 127. ^a Hanc sententiam Christus quando uxorem dimitti non nisi ob adulterium dixit. p. 6. a.

^b Hinc et illud dicit: Membra Christi membris meretricis non esse jungenda. . . . Hinc merito regnum cœlorum non tenent adulteri. p. 6. a. ^c Nam si apostolus ecclesiam sponsam Christi pronunciat. p. 5. a. ^d Inde et apostolus caput mulieris pronuntiavit virum. . . . Ad-

' adds;

adds; *He that loveth his wife, loveth himself. For no man hateth his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Christ the church.* Eph. v. 28, 29.

5. 'Hence' the apostle says; *This is the will of God, that ye should abstain from fornication.* 1 Theff. iv. 3.

6. The respect which this bishop had for the writings of the New Testament appears at the beginning of this tract, or epistle, sent to his people. 'I reckon,' says^f he, 'that I do not neglect to discharge some part of my office whilst I endeavour, especially by daily tracts upon the gospels, to make some improvements and increases of your faith and knowledge of the Lord: for what more useful service is there in the church of the Lord? What is there more becoming the office of a bishop than, by instructions from the divine words of the Lord himself, to lead the faithful to the enjoyment of the promised kingdom of heaven? This is my constant and daily labour and desire, though absent from you: and after my accustomed manner I endeavour to be present with you by the discourses I send you, that, being built on the firm foundation of the gospel, ye may always stand armed against all the wiles of the devil.' Eph. vi. 11. And presently afterwards; 'For this purpose we not only allege words from the sacred fountains of the scriptures, but with the words themselves we join our prayers to the Lord, that he will open both to us and you the treasures of his mysteries, and enable us to act according to our knowledge: for great will be his misery, who knew the Lord's will, and neglected to do it.' Luke xii. 47.

7. He concludes with recommending the study of the scriptures; 'I^z have said a few things only, because it is not my de-

dit tamen et dicit: Quoniam qui uxorem suam diligit, seipsum diligit. Nemo enim carnem suam odio habet, sed nutrit et fovet eam, sicut et Christus ecclesiam. p. 6. a. ^e Hinc apostolus dicit: Hæc est voluntas Dei, ut abstineatis vos a fornicatione. p. 6. a. ^f Aliquas officiorum meorum partes non æstimo præterisse, dum temper enitor, vel maxime quotidianis evangeliorum tractatibus, aliquando vobis fidei et scientiæ per Dominum incrementa præstare. Quid enim aliud in ecclesia Domini utilius geri, quid accommodatius officio episcopi potest inveniri: quam ut doctrina divinorum, per ipsam insinuatâ collataque verborum, possint credentes ad repromissum regnum pervenire sanctorum? Hoc certe mei et operis et mu-

neris, quotidianum votivum negotium, absens licet obtinere conitor, et per literarum præsentiam meam vobis reddere conor. Dum vos solito more allocutionibus missis in fide interpello, ideo convenio, ut evangelicæ radicis firmitate solidati, adversus omnia diaboli prælia stetis semper armati, . . . Non solum proferimus verba, quæ de scripturarum sacris fontibus veniunt, sed et cum ipsis verbis preces ad Dominum et vota sociamus, ut tam nobis quam vobis, et sacramentorum suorum thesauros aperiat, et vires ad implenda quæ cognoscimus tribuat. Periculum enim maius est voluntatem Domini cognovisse, et in Dei voluntatis opere cessasse. p. 5. a.

^z Ego pauca dictavi, quoniam non est propositum, volumen scribere, sed allocu-

' sign

‘ sign to write a volume, but to send you a discourse [or homily].
 ‘ Do you look into the scriptures, and improve yourselves by
 ‘ the precepts there delivered, relating to the virtue I have been
 ‘ recommending to you. My dearest brethren, farewell.’

8. I think we may consider this as an example of the homilies of the time in which this bishop lived : but it would be an additional pleasure to know more exactly the time itself, and the place of his ordinary residence.

IV. The third piece, sometimes ascribed to St. Cyprian, but now generally ^b discarded by learned men as unworthy of that great name, is entitled, Of ⁱ the praise of martyrdom. Bishop Fell thinks this to be ^k only a declamation written by some one for the exercise of his style. Basnage ^l and ^m Du Pin speak of it in the like manner. But ⁿ the learned Benedictine has a more favourable opinion of it, though he does not take it to be a genuine work of St. Cyprian. It appears to me an oration in form, and there is a good deal of affectation in the style. It is allowed to be ancient, but the exact time of it is not easily determined. Considering the character of this book, a short account of it will be sufficient.

1. There are here cited passages of divers books of the New Testament, particularly of the four gospels ; ^o of Matthew, ^p Mark, ^q Luke, and ^r John.

2. He has in like manner quoted or referred to the following epistles of Paul ; the epistle to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, the epistles to the Galatians, the Philippians, the Colossians, and second to Timothy.

3. He quotes 1 Cor. ix. 24, after this manner ; ‘ It is ^s the
 ‘ voice of the most blessed Paul, saying ; *Know ye not that they*
 ‘ *which run in a race strive many, but one receiveth the prize ? But do*
 ‘ *you so run that all may obtain.*’

tionem transnittere. Vos scripturas aspici-
 cite, exempla vobis de ipsis præceptis hu-
 jus rei majora conquirite. Fratres carissi-
 mi, bene valete. p. 8. b. ^b Vid. Pagi

Crit in Baron. 257. n. xv. Basnag. Ann.
 258. n. xv. ⁱ Liber De Laude Mar-
 tyrii. ^k Exercendi stili gratia hæc vi-
 dentur scripta, cum plenos theatri cuneos,
 et populi strepitum sibi representet orator.

Not. p. 8. ed Oxon. ^l Basn. ut supra.
^m Nouv. Bibl. St. Cyprien. ⁿ Vit.
 St. Cyprian. n. xxxv. ^o Legis, scrip-
 tum esse, usque ad quadrantem nos ulti-
 mum reddere. [Matt. v. 26.] p. 11. b.

^p Quæso repetas verba cœlestia, nam et
 vox dicentis est Christi : Qui perdiderit

animam suam pro nomine meo, recipiet in
 hoc sæculo centuplum, et in futuro vitam
 æternam possidebit. [Marc. x. 30.] p. 12.

b. ^q Sicut scriptum est : Qui me con-
 fessus fuerit in terris coram hominibus, et
 ego confitebor eum coram patre meo, et
 coram angelis suis. [Luc. xii. 8.] p. 11. a.

^r Sed quoniam ita Dominus suo ore tes-
 tatus est, esse habitacula penes patrem
 multa. [Johan. xiv. 2.] p. 14. b.

^s Vox est beatissimi Pauli, dicentis : Nes-
 citis, quoniam qui in agone currunt, mul-
 ti certant, unus autem accipit palmam ?
 Vos autem sic currite, ut omnes corone-
 mini, [comprehendatis, Baluz.] p. 15. a.

4. I shall

4. I shall put down a passage of this Latin writer, which may be thought to contain a reference to Hebr. xi. but I do not think it to be clear: however, it deserves to be taken notice of for the sake of the sense as well as for the seeming reference. 'If,' says 'he, 'you are a good man, and believe in God, why are you unwilling to lay down your life for him, who you know has so often suffered for you; who has been sawn asunder in Isaiah, killed in Abel, offered up in Isaac, sold in Joseph, crucified in the flesh? I omit other things, which words cannot express nor the mind conceive.'

5. Finally, perhaps he refers to some passages of the Revelation in some words which I intend to put in the margin as an example of this author's oratorical flights. See Rev. xiii. 8; vi. 11; vii. 13, 14.

V. The fourth piece, ascribed by some to Cyprian, is entitled, To, or ^w Against the heretic Novatian; or, Against the Novatian heretic; that hope of pardon ought not to be denied to those who have lapsed. In the late editions it is called a tract of an unknown author. Du Pin calls it a homily. Tillemont, ^x who allows that the style of this work is different from Cyprian's, and that therefore it is not his, thinks however that it might be written soon after the persecution of Decius, and then of Gallus, in the former part of the reign of Valerian, about the year 254 or 255. He refers to ^y two passages of this work, which compared together seem to render his opinion very probable. The ^z Benedictine, author of St. Cyprian's Life, agrees with Tillemont about the age of this piece. He says, it is certain the author was contemporary with Cyprian, and that it cannot be questioned but he lived near the beginning of the reign

^t Si iustus es, et Deo credis, quod pro eo sanguinem fundere metuis, quem pro te toties passum esse cognoscis; in Esaiâ secutus, in Abel occisus, in Isaac immolatus, in Joseph venundatus, in homine crucifixus es: et de cæteris quidem taceo, quæ nec ratio potest dicere, nec animus sustinere. p. 15. a. ^u O beati, et quibus vere dimissa sunt peccata; si tamen qui Christi compares estis, aliquando peccastis. O beati, quos a primordio mundi Domini sanguis infecit, et quos merito splendor ille nivei amictus induerit, et candor stolæ ambientis ornat! p. 15. b. ^w Ad Novatianum hæreticum: Quod lapsi spes vitæ non est deneganda. ^x See Mem.

Ec. T. iv. Part i. St. Cyprien. Art. 41. ^y Catadysmus ergo ille qui sub Noe factus est figuram persecutionis quæ per totum orbem nunc nuper super effusa ostendit. . . . Duplex ergo illa emissio [columbæ] duplicem nobis persecutionis, tentationem ostendit; prima in qua qui lapsi sunt, victi ceciderunt; secunda in qua hi qui ceciderunt, victores extiterunt. Nul- li enim nostrum dubium vel incertum est, fratres dilectissimi, illos, qui prima acie, id est, Deciana persecutione vulnerati fuerunt, hos postea, id est, secundo prælio ita fortiter perseverasse, ut contemnentes edicta secularium principum [Galli et Volusiani] hoc invictum haberent: quod non metuerunt exemplo boni pastoris animam suam tradere, et sanguinem fundere, nec ullam insipientis tyranni sævitiam recufare. p. 17. b. ^z Vit. St. Cyprian. n. xxxv.

of Valerian, whilst the church had peace. He supposes him likewise to have been an African, and a bishop. Nevertheless, he does not allow this to be a work of Cyprian. And to the argument taken from the difference of the style he adds another, not insisted on by Tillemont.

1. This piece abounds with texts of scripture.

2. 'Whose ^a future ruin,' says he, 'the Lord represents in the gospel, saying; *And he who hears my words, and does them not, I will liken him unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand.*'... Matt. vii. 26, 27. This gospel is quoted here in a like manner several times. I have not observed any thing taken from St. Mark.

3. 'Which ^b power the Lord gave to his disciples, as he says in the gospel; *Behold, I give unto you power to tread on all the power of the enemy, and upon serpents and scorpions, and they shall not hurt you.*' Luke x. 19. In this piece are many texts taken out of this gospel.

4. 'Whom ^c the Lord Christ reckons thieves and robbers, as he himself declares in the gospel, saying; *He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but gets down some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.*' John x. 1.

5. In this piece are also passages of divers epistles of St. Paul, particularly the epistle to the Romans, first to the Corinthians, the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians; which passages are cited expressly as the apostle's, meaning Paul, though the churches to whom those epistles were sent are not named.

6. 'The ^d scripture saying; *Vengeance belongeth to me: I will repay, saith the Lord.*' In the margin of the Oxford edition here is a reference put to Heb. x. 30. But the quotation might be taken from Deut. xxxii. 35; or Rom. xii. 19; and very probably was taken from one or other of those places.

7. 'Have ^e you not read, that *the Lord resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.*' Here too are placed in the same edition James iv. 6, and 1 Pet. v. 5. But the same thing is said also Prov. iii. 34. However, if the writer intended any text of the New Testament, he may be supposed rather to refer to the first epistle of Peter, which was more universally received than

^a Quorum Dominus ruinam in evangelio futuram his verbis significaverat, dicens: qui audit verba mea, et non facit ea, &c. p. 17. b. ^b Quam potestatem tradidit Dominus discipulis suis, sicut in evangelio ait: ... p. 17. b. ^c Quos Dominus Christus fures et latrones designat, sicut

ipse in evangelio declarat, dicens: ... p. 16. b. ^d Dicente scriptura: Mihi vindictam, et ego retribuam, dicit Dominus. p. 18. a. ^e Non legisti: Quia Dominus superbis resistit, humilibus autem dat gratiam? p. 19. b.

that of James, whose authority, it is certain, was not then fully established. Besides, as ^f St. Augustine observes, there is scarce a page of the holy scriptures which does not teach us that *God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble*. There was no occasion therefore for that reference to the epistle of James. However, we have no good ground to say that this author rejected, or did not receive this epistle; for he may have owned it, though he has not quoted it in this work of his.

8. 'Have ^g you not read; *He that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness has blinded his eyes?*' 1 John ii. 11. In another place, 'Whom ^h John calls *antichrists*;' referring probably to 1 John ii. 18; or 2 John, 7.

9. 'As ⁱ it is written; *Behold he cometh with ten thousands of his angels, to execute judgment upon all, and to destroy all ungodly men, and to convince all flesh of all the deeds of the ungodly, which they have ungodly committed, and of all the ungodly words which sinners have spoken of God.*' Jude, 14, 15.

10. The book of the Revelation is much quoted in this treatise. 'But ^k John speaks more plainly [than Daniel before quoted] both of the day of judgment, and of the end of the world, saying; *And when he had opened, says he, the sixth seal, behold there was a great earthquake;*' ... Rev. vi. 12... 17. Likewise in the same Revelation John says, this also was revealed unto him; *I saw, says he, a great throne....*' xx. 11, 12. Thus he has twice ascribed this book to John. He has twice more cited it by the name of Apocalypse or Revelation. In the first of those places thus; 'Hear ^l in the Revelation the voice of the Lord justly reproving thee, ch. iii. 17. *Thou sayest, says he, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and blind, and poor, and naked.*' The other passage is Rev. xvii. 15. In two other places of this treatise it is quoted after this manner; 'And

^f ... ut apostolica illa sententia ubique tremenda sit, qua ait, Quapropter qui videtur stare, videat ne cadat. Nulla enim fere pagina est sanctorum librorum, in qua non sonet, quod Deus superbis resistit, humilibus autem dat gratiam. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. lib. iii. cap. 23.

^g Non legisti: Quia qui odit fratrem in tenebris est? &c. p. 19. b.

^h Quos Joannes antichristos appellat. p. 16. b.

ⁱ Sicut scriptum est: Ecce venit cum multis millibus nunciorum suorum, facere judicium de omnibus, et perdere omnes impios, et arguere omnem carnem de omnibus factis impiorum quæ

fecerunt impie, et de omnibus verbis impiis, quæ de Deo locuti sunt peccatores. p. 20. b.

^k Joannes autem et de die judicii et consummatione mundi declarat, dicens: Et cum aperuisset, inquit, sigillum sextum. ... Item in eadem Apocalypsi hoc quoque Joannes dicit sibi revelatum: Vidi, inquit, thronum magnum, et candidum sedentem super eum, &c. p. 21. a. b.

^l Audi in Apocalypsi Dominicam vocem iustis te objurgationibus increpantem. ... p. 16. a. Sicut Apocalypsis docet, dicens: Aquæ quas vidisti, populi sunt. [cap. xvii. 15.] p. 17. b.

' since

^m since it is written, that the dogs shall remain without:’ xxii. 15. Lastly, ‘the ⁿ scripture proclaiming, and saying; *Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent:*’... ii. 5. Thus he has quoted this book six times, beside a reference or two more, which I do not insist on: and he sufficiently shews that he esteemed it a book of authority; but he has no where called the writer apostle, or evangelist. However, it may be reckoned very probable that by John he means the apostle of that name; the same who wrote the gospel and the epistle which he has quoted.

11. The passages that have been already taken from this treatise evidently shew that the scriptures the writer quotes were esteemed by Christians the rule of their faith and practice. Nevertheless, I shall add one or two more, containing some forms of citation, and marks of respect for these books.

12. Having largely quoted some books of scripture, particularly St. Luke’s gospel, he says; ‘Let ^o us then, my beloved brethren, stir up ourselves as much as possible; and, breaking off the sleep of sloth and security, let us be watchful to observe the commands of the Lord: let us seek with all our heart what we have lost, that we may find; because *to him that seeketh, faith the scripture, it shall be given, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened:*’ Matt. vii. 7, 8. Let us cleanse our house with a spiritual cleansing, that all the secret and hidden parts of our breast, being illuminated by the light of the gospel, may say, *Against thee only have I sinned:*’ Ps. li. 4.

13. ‘We ^p read and adore, says he to the Novatians, and do not overlook the heavenly sentence of the Lord, in which he says; *Him that denies him he also shall deny:*’ Matt. x. 33. Again; ‘hear ^q therefore, ye Novatians, with whom the heavenly scriptures are rather read than understood: it is well if they are not interpolated.’

14. We have now taken so much from this writer, that it may be proper to sum up his testimony. He has cited texts of all the four gospels, except St. Mark’s; and likewise the epis-

^m Et cum scriptum sit, Canes foris remansuros. p. 16. a. ⁿ Clamante scriptura et dicente: Memento unde excideris, et age poenitentiam. p. 19. b. ^o Excitemus nos quantum possumus, fratres dilectissimi, et abrupto inertiae et securitatis somno, ad observanda Domini praecepta vigilemus. Quæramus tota mente quod perdidimus, ut invenire possimus: Quia quærenti, ait scriptura, dabitur, et pulsanti aperietur. Mundemus domum nostram

munditia spirituali, ut secreta quæque et abdita pectoris nostri, vero evangelii lumine radiata, dicant: Tibi soli deliqui. ... p. 20. b. ^p Legimus et adoramus, nec prætermittimus cœlestem Domini sententiam, qua ait negaturum se negantem. p. 19. a. ^q Audite igitur, Novatiani, apud quos scripturæ cœlestes leguntur potius, quam intelliguntur, parum si non interpolentur. p. 16. b.

tle to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, the epistles to the Galatians, the Ephesians and the Philippians, the first epistle of St. John, the epistle of St. Jude, and the book of the Revelation. Though he has not quoted all the books of the New Testament, because, it is likely, he had not occasion so to do in this one treatise, yet it may be well supposed his canon differed very little from ours, if at all. And he has given many proofs, in a short compass, of his high respect for the books of the New Testament, and for the doctrine contained in them.

VI. In the late editions of St. Cyprian's works is a treatise¹ of some anonymous author, first published by Rigaltius, entitled, *Of rebaptizing; or, Of the baptism of heretics: that they ought not to be baptized again, who have been once baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.* This writer is placed by Cave at the year 253. Of this book Du Pin speaks to this purpose: The treatise of the baptism of heretics, published by Rigaltius, against the sentiment of St. Cyprian, is the work of an ancient author, who lived before the time of St. Augustine, and probably at the same time with St. Cyprian. Of this piece Fleury² expresseth himself in this manner: The opinion of St. Stephen, and the greatest part of the churches, was at that time defended by a certain author, whose treatise remains, but whose name we know not. He speaks³ as being a bishop; and he, perhaps, was St. Stephen himself, or some one of his successors. The Benedictine⁴ before quoted delivers his judgment as follows: That the author of this piece was a bishop; and that in the work itself are plain marks of his writing in the third century, and whilst the controversy about the baptism of heretics was on foot, and probably whilst Cyprian was still living. Cave not only admits the episcopal character of this author, and that he was contemporary with Cyprian, but is likewise⁵ inclined to think him to have been of the same country.

1. This book is a good deal larger than any one of the four preceding pieces: it affords a very valuable testimony to the books of the New Testament.

2. St. Matthew's gospel is not expressly quoted in this book

¹ Anonymi liber de Rebaptismate. Non debere denuo baptizari qui semel in nomine Domini [nostri] Jesu Christi sint facti. De baptismo hereticorum.

² Nov. Bib. des Auteurs Ec. St. Cyprien. p. 173. Amst. ³ Fleury's Eccl. Hist. book vii. ch. 31, p. 432: English version.

⁴ Et ideo cum salus nostra in baptismo Spiritus, quod plerumque cum baptismo aquæ coniunctus, sit constituta, quidem per nos baptisma tradetur, integre et solenniter et per omnia quæ scripta sunt assignetur, atque sine ulla ullius rei separatione tradatur: aut si a minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, eventum expectemus, ut aut suppleatur a nobis, aut a Domino supplendum reservetur. p. 26.

⁵ Vit. S. Cyprian. § xxxv.

⁶ Denique stilus, totaque scribendi ratio Tertulliani, vel Cypriani ætatem, quin et gentem satis aperte prodit. H. Lit. P. i. p. 93.

by name, though there are many references to it, and divers texts transcribed from it. The author says, that the disciples did justly believe our Lord to be the Christ, for several reasons he there mentions; and among others, because ^a his star was seen in the East, and he was diligently inquired of and worshipped by the wise men, and honoured by them with rich and splendid gifts and offerings: Matt. ii. 2.... 11.

3. And, not to take notice of any other places, he quotes also some of the last words of this gospel in this manner, 'Nor^b imagine that to be contrary to this argument which the Lord said; Go, *teach the nations, baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*'

4. He expressly quotes St. Mark's and St. Luke's gospels both together after this manner; 'In ^c the gospel according to Luke he says to his disciples: *I have another baptism to be baptized with.* Likewise [in the gospel] according to Mark, he had said to the like purpose to the sons of Zebedee; *Are ye able to drink of the cup that I drink of, or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?*' See Luke xii. 50; Mark x. 38.

This passage seems to afford a probable argument that, in the code, or collection, or volume, of the four gospels, St. Mark's gospel was placed before St. Luke's. This I suppose to be the meaning of that expression, quoting Mark after Luke; likewise he had said; or, he had said to the like purpose. But I do not mention this as a certain proof. He refers likewise to divers things in ^d the second chapter of St. Luke's gospel.

5. 'As ^e it is written in the gospel according to John, *They also baptized others:*' see ch. iv. 2.

6. He has largely cited the book of the Acts of the apostles, and argues from divers things related in it. He has quoted it at least five or six times expressly by that name: 'And ^f our Lord likewise confirming this same word of John, after his resurrection, in the Acts of the apostles, commanded them [the disciples], that they should not depart from Jerusalem, *but wait for that promise of the Father, which ye have heard of me: for John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence:*' Acts i. 3, 4.

^a quod in Oriente visa ejus stella sollicitissime fuisse a magis requisitus et adoratus, et illustribus donis et insignibus muneribus honoratus. p. 25. b. Oxon.

^b Nec æstimes huic tractatui contrarium esse quod Dominus dixit: Ite, docete gentes, tinguite eos nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. ibid. p. 25. a. ^c In evangelio secundum Lucam ad discipulos

suos locutus est, dicens: Habeo aliud baptismum baptizari: Item secundum Marcum ad filios Zebedæi, eadem ratione dixerat: Potestis bibere calicem quem ego bibo, aut baptismo quo ego baptizor baptizari? p. 28. b. ^d Vid. p. 25. b. ^e Et quod multo gravius est, sicut in evangelio cata Joannem scriptum est, etiam alios baptizabant. p. 26. b. ^f Nam et Dominus,

7. This author has quoted or referred to several of St. Paul's epistles, particularly the epistle to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, the epistles to the Ephesians and the Philippians, and first to the Thessalonians.

8. 'Because ^s that being baptized in the name of Christ, they are redeemed with the most precious blood of the Lord: ' 1 Pet. i. 19.

9. 'As ^h also the evangelist John says; *Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God, for God is love:* ' 1 John iv. 7, 8. The author therefore had no doubt but that this epistle was written by the same John who wrote the gospel.

10. 'For ⁱ John teaching us says in his epistle, (1 John v. 6, 7, 8.) *This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ: not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.*

11. 'I ^k think, likewise, that I have rightly represented the doctrine of the apostle John, who says; *For there are three that bear witness; the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three are one.*

12. These quotations shew that this bishop, contemporary with St. Cyprian, had not in his copies of St. John's epistle the disputed text concerning the witnesses in heaven: and they afford likewise a strong and cogent argument for the supposition, that neither had St. Cyprian that text in his copies.

13. There are some expressions made use of by this author, which may seem to imply that the books of the New Testament were divided into sections or chapters.

'And therefore, says ^l he, we shall be obliged to bring together the several paragraphs [literally short chapters] of the sacred scriptures, relating to this purpose.' Afterwards; 'For-

hanc eandem vocem Joannis post suam resurrectionem in Actis apostolorum confirmans, praecepit eis, ab Hierosolymis ne discedere, sed expectare illam promissionem Patris, quam audistis; a me, quia Joannes quidem baptizavit aqua, vos autem baptizabimini Spiritu Sancto non post multos hos dies. p. 22. b. ^g Quia baptizati in nomine Christi redempti sunt pretiosissimo sanguine Domini. p. 20. a.

^h Sicut et Joannes evangelista dicit: Et omnis qui diligit, ex Deo natus est, et cognoscit Deum, quia Deus dilectio est. p. 28.

ⁱ Ait enim Joannes de Domino nostro in epistola sua nos, docens: Hic est qui

venit per aquam et sanguinem Jesus Christus. Non in aqua tantum, sed in aqua et sanguine. Et Spiritus est, qui testimonium perhibet, quia Spiritus est veritas. Quia tres testimonium perhibent, Spiritus et aqua et sanguis. Et isti tres in unum sunt. p. 29. a.

^k Arbitror autem, et apostoli Joannes doctrinam nos non inepte disposuisse, qui ait: Quia tres testimonium perhibent, Spiritus et aqua et sanguis, et isti tres unum sunt. p. 30. b. 31. a.

^l Et ideo quaecunque sanctorum scripturarum ad hanc partem pertinentia sunt capitula, necessario in unum congeremus. p. 22. b.

‘asmuch^m as it is manifestly declared by our Lord in that sentence, (Matt. x. 33) *Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.*’ But the phrases used in these places may denote no more than a text or passage, and do not certainly imply that the books themselves, whence they are taken, were divided into larger or smaller sections.

14. We are now, according to our usual method, to observe a few forms of citation, and some tokens of respect for the scriptures.

‘Norⁿ shall I omit,’ says the author, ‘what the gospel deservedly relates; for our Lord said to the man sick of the palsy (Matt. ix. 2); *Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee.*’ Again; ‘This^o we find mentioned in the gospel.’ In another place; ‘To^p which things perhaps you will weakly answer, according to custom, that the Lord hath said in the gospel (John iii. 5); *Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.*’ To which he replies by an observation upon^q the New Testament, as he expressly calls it. Farther; ‘As^r the holy scripture declares, out of which we shall bring plain proofs of what we assert.’ He means particularly the New Testament. ‘The^s holy scripture foretold, that they who should believe in Christ should be baptized with the Spirit:’ as John vii. 39; Matt. iii. 11; and in other places. ‘As^t the scripture saith; *Out of his belly flowed rivers of living water.*’ John vii. 38. He observes, that^u the Jews received only the ancient scriptures. ‘The scriptures of the New and the Old Testament,’ he^x says, ‘clearly declare’ what he there asserts. Again; of^y this he ‘has no advantage who has not the love of that God and Christ who is preached by the law and the prophets, and in the gospel.’ ‘Because^z that both prophets and apostles have thus taught; for James says in the Acts of

^m Per huiusmodi clausulam quia manifestissime a Domino dictum est: Quicumque me negaverit coram hominibus, negabo eum et ego coram patre meo qui est in caelis. p. 28. a.

ⁿ Sed nec illud omiserim quod evangelium merito predicat. Ait enim paralytico Dominus noster, &c. p. 30. b.

^o Sicuti non solum Petrum hoc passum esse in evangelioprehendimus. p. 25. a.

^p Ad quæ fortasse tu continuo impatienter respondeas, ut soles, dixisse in evangelio Dominum: &c. p. 23. a.

^q Sed in eodem Novo Testamento. p. 24. a.

^r Sicut declarant nobis sanctæ scripturæ, quarum per singula quæque eorum quæ enarrabimus, adferemus perspicuas probationes.

p. 23. a. ^s Quoniam eos qui in Christum credituri essent scriptura sancta prædixit, oportere in spiritu baptizari. p. 23. B.

^t Sicuti scriptura dicit: Flumina de ventre eius currebant aquæ vivæ. p. 29. a.

^u Sicuti nec super Judæos, qui veteres tantum scripturas recipiunt p. 27. b.

^x Quanquam scripturæ novi et veteris testamenti manifeste prædicant. p. 28. b.

^y Quia hoc facto nihil proficit, qui non habet dilectionem ejus Dei et Christi, qui per legem et prophetas et in evangelio hoc modo prædicatur. p. 28. b.

^z Quia et prophetæ et apostoli ita prædicarunt. Ait enim Jacobus in Actis apostolorum. p. 27. b.

'the apostles:' Acts x. 14. Finally, he complains of some who advanced things ^a contrary to the precept of the law and of all the scriptures.

Here are many marks of high respect for the books of the New Testament, which are equalled with, or reckoned superior to, those of the Old Testament; and together with them are esteemed the rule of Christian belief and practice. And the apostles are joined with the prophets.

15. There is still a remarkable passage to be transcribed concerning an apocryphal writing, which passage farther confirms the authority of the sacred scriptures of the New Testament.

He argues against some heretics who made use of fire, as well as water, in the administration of baptism. 'But,' says ^b he, 'the principal foundation (not to mention any other) of this false and pernicious baptism, is a book forged by those same heretics for the sake of this very error, which is called the Preaching of Paul. [Some think it should be Peter. It might be called by both these names.] In which book, contrary to all the scriptures, you will find Christ, who alone never offended at all, both making confession of his own sin, and almost against his will compelled by his mother Mary to receive John's baptism: likewise, that when he was baptized fire was seen upon the water; which is not written in any gospel. And when a considerable time had passed, you will find also, that Peter and Paul, after they had had a conference together about the gospel at Jerusalem, and there had been some mutual difference between them, and an agreement had been entered into about the disposition of things for time to come; after all these things, I say, you will find them meeting in the city [meaning Rome] as if they had never known each other before. And some other things of this kind there are absurdly and shamefully forged: all which you may see heaped together in that book.'

16. There are then in this treatise many quotations of words of the gospel of St. Matthew. The gospels of St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John, are expressly quoted by name; as is also the

^a Contra præceptum legis et omnium scripturarum. p. 22. b.

^b Est autem adulterini huius, immo internecini baptismi, si quis alius auctor, tum etiam quidem ab eisdem ipsis hæreticis propter hunc eundem errorem confectus liber, qui inscribitur Pauli Prædicatione. In quo libro contra omnes scripturas, et de peccato proprio contentem, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Joannis baptismi pene invitum a matre sua esse com-

pulsus. Item cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum, quod in evangelio nullo est scriptum; et post tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum, post conlationem evangelii in Hierusalem et mutuam altercationem et rerum agendarum dispositionem, postremo in urbe quasi tunc primum invicem sibi esse cognitos. Et quædam alia hujuscemodi absurde ac turpiter in illum librum invenies congesta. p. 30.

^c Vid. Baluz, Notas ad h. l.

book of the Acts of the apostles, very often; beside other places where passages are taken out of it; but he has not mentioned the name of the writer of that book. Here are likewise quotations, or references, to several epistles of St. Paul; but the epistles themselves, or the persons to whom they were sent, are not expressly named. It is likely, that one main reason of this method of citing was, that those scriptures were so well known among Christians, that almost every one would know whence the passages were taken, without citing the epistles by name expressly. Words of the first epistle of St. Peter are adopted by him. The first epistle of St. John is quoted, and ascribed to John the apostle and evangelist: and we have observed several forms of citation, and also marks of the greatest respect for the scriptures, and the New Testament in particular. Finally, he mentions an apocryphal spurious book, on which he has made divers just criticisms, shewing it to be a forgery, and expressing the utmost indignation against it: but he affords no plain proofs that the books of the New Testament were then divided into any chapters or sections.

VII. There is yet another piece, called, ^d A Computation of Easter; of which I shall here give an account, it being placed, in the Oxford edition, in an appendix to St. Cyprian's works; and there being good reason to believe it was written about his time. Du Pin ^e and ^f Tillemont allow the antiquity of it; though they think the difference of style so manifest, as to shew plainly that it is not a work of Cyprian. Cave ^g says it is an ancient tract; and if not written by Cyprian, it is, however, the work of some contemporary. In the Oxford edition of St. Cyprian's works this piece is published as being probably genuine; and in his notes the learned editor delivers his judgment upon it to this purpose, in answer to Seneschal, who had denied it to be written by Cyprian: 'That ^h he will not be positive it is the work of that father; but, if it be falsely ascribed to him, yet it is not spurious, or supposititious, but manifestly ancient, and written about that time.' It is indeed, so far as I am able to judge, all over ancient; abating only the errors of the copies, which seem to be not a few.

There are in it divers marks of antiquity: the author ⁱ concludes his chronology at the fifth year of Gordian, and the con-

^d De Pascha Computus.

Bibl. St. Cyprien. ^e Mem. Ec. T. iv. St. Cyprien. art. 65. ^f Hist. Lit. P. i.

p. 89. ^g Ego me vadem non spondeo. Sed si pseudepigraphus sit at spurius non est, et supposititius, sed antiquum esse li-

quet; et Cypriani ætate scriptum, res ipsa docet. Not. p. 63.

ⁱ A quo tempore, id est, a passione, usque ad annum quintum Gordiani, Ariano et Papo consulibus, suppleti sunt anni ccxv. p. 70. b.

fulshp of Arrianus and Papus, which is the year of our Lord 243. It is likely, therefore, that ^k he wrote not much after that time. Pagi ^l thinks this book was published in that very year. Farther, the author says, 'that ^m Christ, having been baptized 'in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, was crucified in the sixteenth 'year of the same reign;' which opinion is ancient, and is more than once insisted on by him. I might add, that ⁿ the doxology at the conclusion of this work is ancient and unexceptionable.

If Pagi be in the right, that the fifth year of Gordian, mentioned in this piece, is the year of its publication, this is an additional argument, beside the difference of style, that it is not Cyprian's; it being probable that he was not converted so soon.

1. Though I do not by any means suppose this to be a work of Cyprian, it deserves to be taken notice of on account of its antiquity. And it is valuable for the testimonies it contains to some facts, as well as to the books of the New Testament, which I am now to observe.

2. This writer says, expressly, that ^o there are four gospels; or, as another copy has it, evangelists; and twelve apostles; and that the gospel is one divided into four parts.

3. He has not mentioned the names of the evangelists, but he has quoted words of the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John. I shall transcribe a few passages, chiefly to shew the author's method of citing, and his respect for the scriptures in general.

4. 'These ^p are the days, of which the Lord says in the gospel; *And except those days were shortened there should be no flesh saved:*' Matt. xxiv. 22.

5. 'Of whom ^q Simeon, a just man, holding him in his hands, *said to Mary, his mother; Behold this [child] is set for the fall and*

^k Vid. Not. ed. Ox. p. 70.

^l Fellus V. C. in notis ad Computum de Pascha, cujus S. Cyprianum auctorem credit, quique perducitur usque ad annum quintum Gordiani, observat, Chronicorum Scriptores res perducere ad annum aliquem insigniorem etiam paulo prateritum; idque in eo opere videri factum, nimirum ad annum Gordiani Imp. ultimum. Verum auctor non ad ultimum Gordiani annum, sed ad ejus Quinquennalia respexit, quibus scriptores de more opera sua publicabant. Pagi Crit. in Bar. A. D. 243. ^m Hi sunt apostoli, quorum sermonibus edificati recognovimus Dominum nostrum anno sexto decimo imperii Tiberii Caesaris passum, cum esset ipse annorum xxxi. p. 69. b. . . quibus suppletis Dominus Jesus a nativitate sua baptizatus est a Johanne anno quinto decimo imperii Tiberii Caesaris; cujus anno sexto decimo passus est et resurrexit. p. 70. b.

tizatus est a Johanne anno quinto decimo imperii Tiberii Caesaris; cujus anno sexto decimo passus est et resurrexit. p. 70. b.

ⁿ Ac propterea Deo Patri Omnipotenti, qui nos ad gratiam tantam vocavit, et divina sacramenta manifestavit, per Jesum Christum filium ejus Dominum et Salvatorem nostrum semper sine cessatione gratias agamus. p. 70. b. ^o Et sic, per hanc multiformem trinitatem, et ipse duodecim horæ evangelium unum in quatuor partes divisum ostenderunt, et tres menses per quatuor tempora, id est, per quatuor evangelia, a Christo electos xii. apostolos nobis demonstraverunt. p. 69. b.

^p Ipsi sunt dies, de quibus ait Dominus in evangelio, &c. p. 68. b.

^q P. 69. a. b.

‘*rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken against:*’ Luke ii. 28, 34.

6. ‘*And*’ rightly said our Lord and Master himself to the Jews; *If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham:*’ John viii. 39.

7. He has a remarkable quotation of the Acts in this manner; ‘*From*’ *Josbua the son of Nun to Samuel the judge, and priest of God, according to the blessed apostle Paul, who was taught by the Spirit of God, were fulfilled four hundred and fifty years:*’ See Acts xiii. 20.

This seems to shew at once that the Acts was esteemed a book of the inspired scriptures, and that it was well known; otherwise, the author would have shewn more particularly where these words of the apostle Paul were to be found.

8. He ^t says, ‘*We are built upon the words of the apostles.*’ Perhaps he refers to Eph. ii. 20: but, whether he does or not, this observation is worthy of our notice.

9. ‘*Which make,*’ says ^u he, ‘*according to the Revelation, a thousand and two hundred and sixty days; in which days that antichrist will make a great destruction; and therefore no Christian will be able to offer sacrifice to God, because that most wicked one will begin to sit in the temple of God, and to say to the ignorant that he is God; whom our Lord and Saviour Jesus will kill [or consume] with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming.*’ Here is a quotation of Rev. xii. 6; and a reference to 2 Thes. ii. 4, 8.

10. I forbear to insist on any other allusions to the books of the New Testament or any expressions, that ^x may seem to intend the whole collection of them. He speaks of ^y the holy and divine scriptures in words, which may more directly relate to the Old Testament; but it cannot be questioned, that he had an equal respect for the New; which contains the words of our Saviour, and of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and his apostles.

^r Et merito Dominus et Magister noster dicebat Judæis, &c. p. 67. a. ^s ... a Jesu filio Nave usque ad Samuelem judicem, et Dei sacerdotem, secundum Pauli B. apostoli sermonem, qui Spiritu Dei edoctus retulit eos implevisse annos ccccl. p. 67. a. ^t See before note ^u — qui sunt dies, secundum Apocalypsin, mille cclx. in quibus diebus ille antichristus magnam faciet vastationem: et ideo tunc nemo Christianorum poterit Deo sacrificium offerre, quoniam ipse nequissimus incipiet in tem-

plo Dei sedere, et ignorantibus se Deum affirmare: quem oportet Jesum Dominum et Salvatorem nostrum spiritu oris sui intericere, et presentia adventus sui evacuare. p. 68. a. b.

^x ... in quibus oportet primo Enoch et Eliam venire, et per suam prophetiam magnæ multitudini evangelium, id est, Novum Testamentum confirmare. p. 68. a.

^y Multo quidem non modico tempore anxii fuimus et æstuantes, non in secularibus, sed in sanctis et divinis scripturis, quærentes invenire, quænam, &c. p. 63. a.

THE
CREDIBILITY
OF THE
GOSPEL HISTORY;
PART II.

[VOL. V. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCXLIV.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

WHEN I began this work, I declined writing the history of the heretics of the first two centuries, because of the difficulty of the subject, and for some other reasons; not intending to omit it entirely, but deterring it till another opportunity, if God permit: but when I came lower I did not discern those reasons any longer: accordingly, I placed near the beginning of the fourth volume a chapter, containing the history of Noetus and others called heretics, in the former part of the third century: and, in the chapter of Dionysius of Alexandria, I inserted an account of Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, and the controversies about the millennium, and the baptism of heretics. Following this method, the Manicheans, who appeared about the year 280, should have been in this volume, which carries down the history of catholic writers to the year of Christ 300: but, for want of room, I have been obliged to reserve their history for the next volume; which is in good forwardness, and I hope may be published next winter.

It is not unlikely, that some may begin to charge me with prolixity in this work, which is already increased to several volumes: but it should be considered that my volumes are small for a design of this nature, being in the octavo form only: and I believe that they who have read them, so far as we have proceeded, are convinced of the propriety of writing, when we can, the history of authors in the words of their contemporaries, or such as lived near their time; and, of the necessity of taking some particular notice of the works ascribed to them, for distinguishing their genuine writings from spurious, that we may admit of none but credible witnesses, liable to no suspicion: and some select passages may be of use, to shew the learning and piety of the primitive Christians, and their sentiments upon some points, which have been much controverted in late ages. Moreover, the particular design of this work, as formerly shewn, is to enable persons of ordinary capacities,

ADVERTISEMENT.

capacities, who have not an opportunity of reading many authors, to judge for themselves concerning the external evidence of the facts related in the New Testament. I write chiefly for gentlemen, and such others, as are not possessed of large libraries; and therefore I produce passages of ancient authors at length, and oftentimes transcribe also the original words at the bottom of the page, that this evidence may at once appear in a clear and satisfactory light. All which things take up a great deal of room: but, since they cannot be well omitted, I do not see any good reason to alter my method; and I presume it will be still approved by others. When we get below Eusebius of Cæsarea, it will not be needful to be so particular.

Feb. 14, 1743-44

CHAP.

I.
' are
' Fal
' Ita
' tho
' no
' rain
' ing
' ed
of Il
Fa
ordin
suffe
death
upon
the c
June
Rom
bilio
ral a
Rom
city,
a Co
ad que
scripsit
ecclesi
Italica
et de h
synodi
prolix
anathe
annis
ob Ch
Lucius
vi. cap
vii.
bilio
est epis
difficul
Epist.
Oxon,

C H A P. XLVI.

St. CORNELIUS and St. LUCIUS, bishops of Rome.

I. *St. Cornelius.* II. *St. Lucius.*

I. 'CORNELIUS,^a bishop of the city of Rome, to whom there are eight of Cyprian's letters still extant, wrote an epistle to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, concerning the synod at Rome, in Italy, and Africa; and another concerning Novatus, and of those that had lapsed; a third concerning the acts of the synod; a fourth to the same Fabius, which is very long, and contains the rise and condemnation of the Novatian heresy. Having been crowned with martyrdom for Christ, he was succeeded by Lucius.' So writes St. Jerom in his Catalogue, or book of Illustrious men.

Fabian, who sat in the see of Rome fourteen years, of whose ordination Eusebius^b has given us a very remarkable history, suffered martyrdom^c in the month of January 250. After his death there was a vacancy for about the space of sixteen months, upon account of^d the troubles they were in, during which time the clergy of Rome governed the church. In the beginning of June 251, the heat of the persecution being somewhat abated at Rome, even before the death of Decius, Cornelius was chosen bishop and successor of the above-named Fabian, with the general approbation^e of the clergy and people of the church of Rome, and the concurrence^f of sixteen bishops, then in the city, as St. Cyprian writes.

^a Cornelius Romanæ urbis episcopus, ad quem octo Cypriani exstant epistolæ, scripsit epistolam ad Fabium, Antiochenæ ecclesiæ episcopum, de synodo Romana, Italica, Africana; et aliam de Novatiano, et de his qui lapsi sunt; tertiam de gestis synodi; quartam ad eundem Fabium valde prolixam, et Novatianæ hæreseos causas et anathema continentem. Rexit ecclesiam annis duobus sub Gallo et Volusiano, cui ob Christum martyrio coronato successit Lucius. De V. I. cap. 66. ^b H. E. L. vi. cap. 29. ^c Vid. Pagi Crit. 250. n. vii. ^d — quibus, post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ viri Fabiani, nondum est episcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates constitutus. Cleri Roman. Epist. ap. Cyprian. Ep. 30, [al. 31] p. 58. Oxon.

^e Factus est autem Cornelius

episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio, de clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis quæ tum affuit suffragio, et de sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio; cum nemo ante se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus—vacaret. Cypr. Ep. 55, p. 104.—qui episcopo Cornelio in catholica ecclesia de Dei judicio et cleri ac plebis suffragio ordinato, profanum altare erigere, —tentaverit. Id. Ep. 68. Pam. 67, p. 177. ^f Et factus est episcopus a plurimis collegis nostris, qui tunc in urbe Roma erant, qui ad nos literas honorificas, et laudabiles, et testimonio suæ prædicationis illustres de ejus ordinatione miserunt. Cypr. Ep. 55 [Pam. 52], p. 104. Episcopo in ecclesia a sedecim coepiscopis facto, Ibid. p. 112.

The election, however, was not unanimous. Some, both of the clergy and people of Rome, dissented: by whom Novatus was chosen bishop, who was ordained also by three Italian bishops.

Both Cornelius and Novatus sent abroad ^z letters and deputies to foreign bishops and churches, notifying their election and ordination: but Cornelius's letters and deputies met with, generally, the most favourable reception: he therefore was approved of as rightful possessor of that see; and Novatus is esteemed the first antipope, and the first author of schism at Rome.

In ^h October 251, Cornelius convened a numerous council at Rome, consisting ⁱ of sixty bishops, and a much larger number of presbyters and deacons, who all confirmed his election, and condemned Novatus, and the rigid doctrine he now went into concerning the lapsed. Cornelius likewise took the sentiments of other bishops in Italy, who could not be present at the council held at Rome; which is, probably, what ^k Jerom means by the Italian synod. And the same things having been resolved upon in a council at Carthage, we have at length the three synods mentioned by Jerom, and the sense of ^l Eusebius, whom Jerom copied.

There is little certainly known of Cornelius's life, before he was advanced to this bishopric; except that ^m Cyprian says he had passed through all the lower offices in the church, and behaved well therein.

St. Jerom in his Catalogue, as we have seen already, says that Cornelius was crowned with martyrdom. He speaks to the like purpose ⁿ elsewhere. St. Cyprian ^o likewise calls Cornelius a martyr: but, though Jerom seems to say that Cornelius died at Rome, it is at present the general ^p opinion that he died at Circumcellæ, now Civita Vecchia, whither he had been banished

^z Vid. Cypr. Ep. 44. init. et Ep. 45, [42] p. 87. Oxon. ^h Vid. Pagi Crit. 251. n. xxvi. Basn. 251, n. viii. ⁱ Vid. Euseb. l. vi. cap. 43, p. 242. A.

^k Vid. Pagi ibid. et Tillemont St. Corneille. Art. 8. p. 33, 34. Tom. iii. P. iii.

^l Euseb. l. vi. cap. 43, p. 242. B. Conf. eund. p. 245. D. ^m Nam quod ad Cornelium,—non iste ad episcopatum subito pervenit, sed per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus, et in divinis administrationibus Dominum sepe promeritus, ad sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit. Cypr. Ep. 55, [al. 52.] p. 103.

ⁿ Sub Decio et Valeriano persecutoribus, quo tempore Cornelius Romæ, Cyprianus Carthagine, felici cruore martyrium pertulerunt. — De Vit. Paul. Erem. T. iv. P. ii. Edit. Bened. ^o Unde illic repentina persecutio nuper exorta sit, unde contra ecclesiam Christi et episcopum Cornelium beatum martyrem, vosque omnes secularis potestas subito proruperit. Cypr. Ep. 61, [al. 58] p. 144. Si vero apud Cornelium fuit, qui Fabiano episcopo legitima ordinatione successit, et quem, præter sacerdotii honorem, martyrio quoque Dominus glorificavit. Id. Ep. 69, [al. 76] p. 181. ^p Tillemont St. Corneille. Art. 16. Pearson. Annot. Cypr. 252. n. xii. xiii. Pagi 252, n. xii. Basn. 252, n. x.

p. 5.

by Gallus. Jerom having said of Cyprian, that ^a he died on the same day of the month, though not in the same year, with Cornelius, it is concluded that Cornelius died on the 14th of September 252.

Jerom says that Cornelius governed the church two years, under Gallus and Volusian. But those two years must not be reckoned complete; for the most learned critics and chronologers compute that ^r his episcopate was not above one year, three months, and ten days; part under Decius, and part under Gallus: and yet Eusebius gives him ^s about three years. However, he may be supposed to allow him all the space of time from the death of Fabian, including the vacancy of the see. But Du Pin ^t is greatly mistaken in saying that he died near the end of the year 253, having been bishop two years and some months.

Cornelius has a place in Jerom's Catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, who mentions four of his letters sent to Fabius; though it is ^u supposed now, by some learned men, that Eusebius ^x speaks of but three epistles of Cornelius to that bishop of Antioch. However, it cannot be questioned but Cornelius wrote other letters beside those mentioned by Jerom. Eusebius ^y speaks of a letter of his to Dionysius of Alexandria. He likewise wrote several letters ^z to Cyprian, two of which ^a we still have. And Trithemius expressly says, that ^b Cornelius wrote many letters to Cyprian bishop of Carthage, and other letters to others. The eight letters of Cyprian to Cornelius, mentioned by Jerom, still remain.

I shall by and by make use of the long letter to Fabius, mentioned by Jerom, there being considerable fragments of it preserved by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History.

There are not many texts of scripture quoted in the two remaining letters of Cornelius to Cyprian, or the just-mentioned fragments: but it may be well taken for granted, that he received the same books with Cyprian and other Christians of that age.

I take no notice of the pieces which, without ground, have been ascribed by some to this bishop of Rome. Such as desire

^a Passus est, — eodem die quo Romæ Cornelius, sed non eodem anno. D. V. I. cap. 47.

^r Vid. Pearson. An. Cypr. 251, n. vi. Pagi 251, n. xix. Tillem. ut supra. Art. 16, p. 70, et note 14.

^s H. E. I. vii. cap. 27. ^t Nouv. Bibl. T. I. p. 180. Amsterd.

^u Vid. Basnag. Ann. 252, n. xi. ^x H. E. L. vi. cap. 40.

^y P. 141, B. C. D. ^z — καὶ Κορινθίῳ

τῷ καὶ Ρωμαῖν γραφεῖ, δεξαμένῳ αὐτῇ τῇ κατὰ τὴ Νουμῆν ἐπιτολῇ. H. E. I. vi. cap. 46, p. 247. D.

^a Apud Cyprian. Ep. 49, 50. [juxta Pamelium. 46, 48.] ^b Ad Cyprianum Carthaginensem episcopum plures scripsit epistolas, et alias ad alios.

Trithem. de Script. Ec. cap. 40.

farther

206 *Credibility of the Gospel History.* Part II. Ch. XLVI. vol. 5. p. 8.
farther information of these may consult ^c Basnage, ^d Tillemont, and others.

II. Cornelius, as St. Jerom says, was succeeded by Lucius. Herein he agrees with ^e Eusebius, who adds, that Lucius did not sit out full eight months. At present, the day of his ordination and the duration of his episcopate are reckoned ^f uncertain. However, bishop Pearson thought it probable that ^g Lucius was ordained on the 25th of September, and sat five whole months and ten days, dying on the 4th of March 253. Basnage ^h differs very little from him. Lucius was banished from Rome under Gallus; but he soon ⁱ returned. Of his speedy release there is no reason known, beside the divine goodness. We have a letter of St. Cyprian to Lucius, wherein he congratulates him ^k upon his return from his exile, as he says he had done before upon his ordination and confession. In another letter, written afterwards to pope Stephen, Cyprian ^l calls Lucius a martyr; but that word is not here to be understood strictly; for, properly speaking, Lucius was only a confessor.

We know of no writings of Lucius, but ^m such as are ascribed to him without ground.

C H A P. XLVII.

NOVATUS, otherwise called NOVATIAN.

I. *His history.* II. *His and his followers' peculiar opinions.* III. *The time of his taking up his particular sentiment.* IV. *History of his followers.* V. *His works.* VI. *His character.* VII. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament.* VIII. *Scriptures received by the Novatians, his followers.*

ST. JEROM's chapter of (A) Novatus, next following that of Dionysius of Alexandria, being short, I shall transcribe it here

^c Ann. 252, n. xii. ^d Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. iii. Saint Corneille, Art. 17, p. 71, et Note xv. ^e Lib. vii. cap. 2.

^f Pagi Crit. 252, n. 14. — 17.

^g Annal. Cyprian. 252. n. 15.

^h Ann. 252, n. 13. ⁱ Pearson. ib. n. 18.

^k Et nuper quidem tibi, frater carissime, gratulati sumus, cum te honore geminato in ecclesie sue administratione confellorem pariter et sacerdotem constituit divina dignatio: Sed et nunc non minus tibi et comitibus tuis atque universae fraternitati gratulamur, quod cum eadem gloria et laudibus vestris re-

duces vos denuo ad suos fecerit benigna Domini et larga protectio. Cypr. Ep. 61, [al. 58] init.

^l Servandus est enim antecessorum nostrorum beatorum martyrum Cornelii et Lucii honor gloriosus. — Illi enim pleni Spiritu Dei et in glorioso martyrio constituti dandam esse lapidationem pacem censuerunt. Ep. 68 [al. 67], p. 179.

^m Vid. Basnage. ibid. n. xiv. (A) of Novatus. He is now generally called Novatian: but I hope to shew at the end of this chapter, that his true name is Novatus.

P. II.

entire: 'Novatus,^a presbyter of the city of Rome, having endeavoured to invade the episcopal chair in opposition to Cornelius, formed the sect of the Novatians, whom the Greeks call pure; not allowing apostates to be received, though they repent. The first author of this rigid principle was Novatus, Cyprian's presbyter. His works are such as these; Of Easter, Of the Sabbath, Of circumcision, Of the (B) high-priest, Of prayer, Of Jewish meats, [another (c) piece, the title of which I do not understand], Concerning Attalus; and many other; and Of the trinity, a large volume, being a kind of epitome of a work of Tertullian. Many by mistake consider this as a work of Cyprian.'

There is another authentic account of Novatus in the fragments of the before-mentioned long letter of Cornelius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, which we have preserved in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History. As it is the usual method of this work to take the history of writers, as often as we can, from contemporaries, it is fit we should hear Cornelius.

In this letter, written after the council of Rome, where Novatus and his principles had been condemned, near the end of the year 251, or at the beginning of 252, Cornelius informs Fabius, that several of those, who had sided with Novatus, had now deserted him. 'Maximus,' says^b he, 'a presbyter among us, and Urbanus, who have acquired great honour by the confessions they have made of our religion; and Sidonius, and Celerinus, a man who, through the divine mercy, has patiently endured all kinds of torments, and by the strength of his faith, surmounting the weakness of his body, completely vanquished the enemy; all these, he^c says, having detected Novatus's subtilty, his lies, perjuries, unsociable and wolfish disposition, were returned to the holy church, giving proofs of all these things in the presence of divers bishops and presbyters, and a great number of the laity; lamenting and con-

^a Novatianus Romanæ urbis presbyter, adversus Cornelium cathedram sacerdotalem conatus invadere, Novatianorum, quod Græce dicitur *καθαροι* [al. *καθαροί*] dogma constituit, nolens apostatas suscipere penitentes. Huius auctor Novatus, Cypriani presbyter, fuit. Scripsit autem de Pascha, de Sabbatho, de Circumcisione, de Sacerdote, de Oratione, de Cibis Judaicis, de Instantia, de Attalo, multaque alia, et de Trinitate grande volumen, quasi *epitome* operis Tertulliani faciens: quod plene nescientes Cypriani existimant.

Hieron. de Vir. Ill. cap. 70. (B) Of the high-priest.] In the Latin, de Sacerdote. But whether my translation be right, I cannot say. Du Pin translates, du Souverain Pontife; Tillemont, sur le Pontife. (c) another piece, the title of which I do not understand.] In the Latin of Jerom, de Instantia: in the Greek version of Sophronius, *περί τῆς ἐκστάσεως*: by Du Pin translated, de la Fureur; by Tillemont, sur l'Instance. ^b Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. vi. cap. 43, p. 242. D. ^c Ibid. p. 243. A.

'fessing

‘fessing their fault, that, being seduced, they had for a time
 ‘withdrawn themselves from the church.’ And soon after, as
 Eusebius says, Cornelius adds; ‘This^d wonderful man, this
 ‘zealous defender of church discipline in all its strictness, when
 ‘he had determined to seize the episcopate, which was not
 ‘assigned him by heaven, chose out two of his associates, men
 ‘of an abandoned character: these he sent into an obscure cor-
 ‘ner of Italy, to fetch thence three bishops, simple and illiterate
 ‘men, whom they persuaded to believe that, a difference having
 ‘arisen at Rome, they ought by all means to hasten thither to
 ‘assist as mediators, together with other bishops, in composing it.
 ‘When they were come to Rome, they being, as I said, per-
 ‘sons of little experience, and unacquainted with the arts and
 ‘subtilities of designing men, he shut them up in a private apart-
 ‘ment with some of his confidants; and when he had made
 ‘them eat and drink to excess, at four of the clock in the after-
 ‘noon^e he compelled them to ordain him bishop, by a vain and
 ‘ineffectual imposition of their hands. Not long after one of
 ‘those bishops came to the church, with tears lamenting and
 ‘confessing his fault; whom we received to communion, as a
 ‘layman, at the earnest entreaties of the people. Having de-
 ‘posed the other two, we appointed successors in their room,
 ‘whom we have sent to take possession of their sees. Such dis-
 ‘turbances and divisions has this zealous defender of the gospel
 ‘caused in a church where he knows there are forty-six presby-
 ‘ters, seven deacons, and as many sub-deacons; forty-two aco-
 ‘lyths, exorcists, readers, and porters, fifty-two; and above fifteen
 ‘hundred widows and other indigent persons; who are all main-
 ‘tained by the grace and bounty of the Lord. But no respect
 ‘for all these, nor for the vast multitude of the people of this
 ‘large and flourishing church, could restrain him from so des-
 ‘perate an attempt.’ Then, says Eusebius, after some other
 things intervening he proceeds; ‘And what was the grounds
 ‘of these aspiring thoughts? upon what worthy deeds of his
 ‘did he build his hopes of a bishopric? was it, that^f he had
 ‘been always and from the beginning of the church; or had suf-
 ‘fained many combats in its defence; or had been in many
 ‘dangers for the sake of religion? No: the^g first occasion of
 ‘his faith was a dangerous distemper; and, when all hopes of
 ‘life were gone, he received baptism by the pouring on of wa-
 ‘ter as he lay in his bed, if that may be called baptism. More-

^d Ibid. C. D. et p. 244. ^e ἀπὸ δεκάτῃ. ib. p. 243. D. ^f ἀπὸ γὰρ διὰ τὸ εἶναι
 ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀνεστραφέναι; ib. p. 244. B. ^g Ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς γὰρ ἀφορμὴ τῆς πίστεως
 γέγονεν, — κ. λ. ib. C.

‘over, afterwards, through fear and fondness of life, in the time of persecution he disowned his being a presbyter. For being desired by the deacons to come out of his chamber, where he had shut himself up, and to comfort and encourage the brethren as became a presbyter to do, he was so far from complying with their entreaties, that he put them off with scorn, saying he would be no longer a presbyter, and that he was for another sort of philosophy.’ And to pass over some other things, says Eusebius, he observes; ‘Thus ^h behaved this person, who had been made presbyter by the special favour of the bishop of that time, when all the clergy and most of the people opposed it; forasmuch as it was not a regular thing, to admit a man into the number of the clergy, who had only been besprinkled as he was in his bed under a distemper.’ Cornelius says likewise, in this letter, that ⁱ Novatus had obliged his followers to take an oath upon the eucharist, that they would never forsake him, to go over to his adversary. Nevertheless, Cornelius soon after adds; ‘He ^k is now left almost alone, the brethren deserting him daily, and returning to the church. Whom also Moses, a blessed martyr, who among us lately suffered a glorious martyrdom, perceiving the confidence and presumption of the man, separated from his communion, together with five presbyters, who with him had schismatically forsaken the church.’ To conclude; Eusebius ^l says, that at the end of this epistle Cornelius expressly mentions the names of the bishops who had met in council at Rome, and there condemned Novatus, and the names of the churches they governed; as also the names of those bishops who could not be present at Rome, but by letters had signified their concurrence in the same resolutions, and the names of the cities to which they belonged.

We have now seen the account which Cornelius gives of Novatus; and if there were remaining any letter of Novatus relating to Cornelius and his election, it is very likely we should not be unwilling to produce it. However, having put down these histories from Jerom and Cornelius, I shall endeavour to take in a few other particulars, and make some remarks.

Philostorgius ^m says that Novatus was a Phrygian; but Photius, who relates this from him, adds, that he does not know whence he learned it. Valesius ⁿ indeed is inclined to give credit to Philostorgius; but I think that ^o Mr. Jackson has shewn it to be very improbable: nor does there appear to be any other

^p p. 241. A. ^q p. 245. B. ^r Ib. C. ^s Ib. D. ^t Philost. H. E. L. viii. cap. 15. ^u Vales. Not. ad Socrat. H. E. L. iv. c. 28. p. 57. ^v Vid. Jackson. Pref. p. viii.

ground for that supposition, but that the sect of the Novatians was numerous in Phrygia.

It is probable, from the account which Cornelius gives of Novatus's sickness and baptism, that he was not born of Christian parents. It is generally thought that he was at first a stoic philosopher. So ^p says Cave. And Mr. Jackson ^a thinks this agreed on all hands. But I do not know of any ancient writers who call Novatus a stoic, though his philosophy and eloquence be often mentioned by ^r them. Tillemont was aware of this, and says, 'that ^s the ancients have not expressly said what was the ' philosophy which he professed: but we know that it was the ' stoic philosophy which taught that rigour, and that parity of ' sins, which Cyprian reproaches Novatus with. And ^t Du Pin is so cautious, as to say no more than that Novatus had been a philosopher before he was a Christian. After the same manner speaks ^u Frederic Spanheim.

Novatus was presbyter of the church of Rome; that is out of question. But Cornelius does not inform us of the name of the bishop by whom he was ordained: it is however very probable that it was Fabian, or one of his near predecessors.

St. Jerom says that Novatus, Cyprian's presbyter, was the first author of the sect which Novatus formed. St. Cyprian, who gives a very bad character of his presbyter, confirms ^s that account; making him the principal cause of all the disturbances that happened at Rome: and ^y Pacian, who was well acquainted with St. Cyprian's letters, writes to the same purpose. But the Greek writers take no notice of this: nor is there any mention of that African Novatus in the fragments of Cornelius's letter to Fabius, which I have largely transcribed.

^p Novatianus, ex stoico philosopho Christianus. Cav. Hist. Lit. ^q Consentiant autem omnes, ex stoico philosopho Christiani nomen induisse Romæ. Jackson. *ibid.* ^r Jactet se licet, et philosophiam vel eloquentiam suam superbis vocibus prædicet. Cypr. Ep. 55, [al. 52] p. 112. Quid ad hæc Novatianus?—in perniciem fratrum lingua sua perstrepsens, et facundie venenatæ jacula contorquens; magis durus secularis philosophiæ pravitæ, quam philosophiæ dominicæ lenitate pacificus, &c. Id. Ep. 60, [Pam. 57] p. 142. Ignosco tamen, frater, si quid et tu de tuo auctore præsumis, et Novatiani philosophiam, per quam ille naufragium religionis incurrit, cum Hesiæoli auctoritate conjungis. Pacian. ad Symphon. Ep. 2. p. 328. C. ap. Bibl. Patr.

T. iv. Ita tuus iste philosophus, sapientiam suam quærens statuere, &c. Id. *ibid.* G. ^s Tillemont Saint Corneille, Art. iv. Mem. Ec. T. iii. P. iii. p. 15.

^t Bib. des Aut. Ecc. Novatien.

^u Novatianus ex philosopho et clinico factus Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyter, &c. Fr. Span. Hist. Ec. Sec. iii. p. 781.

^y Idem est Novatus, qui apud nos primum discordiæ et schismatis incendium seminavit;—qui in ipsa persecutione ad evertendas fratrum mentes alia quædam persecutio nostris fuit.—Plane, quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere, illic majora et graviora commisit. Qui istic adversus ecclesiam diaconum fecerat, illic episcopum fecit. Cypr. Ep. 52, [al. 49] p. 97. ^y Ep. 3. p. 310. E. F. ap. Bibl. PP. T. iv.

Cornelius

Cornelius says, that in the time of the persecution Novatus refused to comfort the brethren, though desired by the deacons; and that he even disclaimed the character of a presbyter, and in effect renounced the Christian religion; saying that he was for another kind of philosophy. But it may be suspected that here is some mistake, or some misrepresentation. It is manifest, that during a large part of the Decian persecution, and for some good while after the martyrdom of Fabian, Novatus maintained his rank, and was in great repute with his brethren the clergy of Rome. For the letter sent to Cyprian in the name of the Roman clergy, and allowed ^a by all to have been drawn up by Novatus, was not written till about ^a the end of August 250: and the anonymous author of the tract against Novatus, joined with St. Cyprian's works, says, 'that ^b Novatus, so long as he was in the church, bewailed the faults of other men as his own, bore the burdens of the brethren, as the apostle directs, and by his exhortations strengthened such as were weak in the faith.' Possibly some retirement of Novatus is the foundation of this charge. But every flight or retreat, in time of persecution, is not really blameable; though such things rarely escape censure. There were other good and eminent men about that time who did the same; Cyprian in particular, who yet afterwards had a glorious martyrdom. And Novatus's treatise of Jewish meats was ^c actually written in some retired place: and, as it is a letter, it appears farther from it, that he was upon good terms with those to whom he writes, and that he had written to them more than

^a Nam in epistola sua ita posuerunt.—

Additum est etiam, Novatiano tunc scribente, et quod scripserat sua voce recitante, et presbytero Moyse, tunc adhuc consiliario, nunc jam martyre, subscribente; et lapsis infirmis, et in exitu constitutis, pax daretur. Quae literae per totum mundum missae sunt, et in notitiam ecclesiis omnibus et universis fratribus perlatae sunt. Cyp. ad Antonian. Ep. 55, [al. 52] p. 122. Vid. etiam. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 310. D. ^a Mense Augusto exeunte Cyprianus Romanus scribit ad Cyprianum literas, &c. Pearson. Ann. Cyp. A. 250. n. xvi. Conf. Pagi Crit. 250. n. xiii.

^b Unde igitur et tam sceleratus, et tam peccatus, tam discordiae furore vefanus, existerit iste Novatianus, invenire non possum; qui semper in domo una, id est, Christi ecclesia, proximorum delicta ut propria flevit, onera fratrum, sicut apostolus hortatur, sustinuerit, lubricos in fide Christi allegatione corroboraverit. Anon.

ad Novat. Hæret. p. 19. m. Oxon.

^c Et si mihi, fratres sanctissimi, exoptatissimus dies ille,—quo literas vestras et scripta suscipio, (quid enim me aliud nunc faciat liberiores?) tamen non minus egregium diem et inter eximios arbitror computandum, quo similis vobis affectus debita caritatis remittens, et ego ad vos compari voto literas scribo. Nihil enim me, fratres sanctissimi, tantis constrictum vinculis tenet,—quam ne iacturam vobis quandam per absentiam meam putetis illatam, cui remedium conitor dare, dum elaboro vobis me præsentem frequentibus literis exhibere. Quamquam ergo et officium debitum et cura suscepta et ipsa ministerii imposita persona hanc a me literarum scribendarum exposcunt necessitatem.—Quam vero sint perversi Judæi et ab intellectu suæ legis alieni, duabus epistolis superioribus, ut arbitror, plene ostendi. De Cib. Jud. cap. 1. p. 255,—258. Ed. Jackson.

once, to comfort them, since his retreat; where also he had received divers affectionate letters from them, asking his council and assistance. Mr. Jackson ^d supposeth that this letter, or treatise, was sent by Novatus from the place of his retreat under the Decian persecution near the end of the year 250, to the people of the church of Rome, from whom he was then necessarily absent. If this could be relied upon, it might entirely wipe off the blot which Cornelius has cast upon Novatus: for then it might be reckoned that this retreat is the thing to which Cornelius refers, but gives it a wrong turn; whilst from that letter it appears not to have given offence to any body at that time. But ^e some think that Novatus there writes in the character of a bishop. Then this piece must be supposed to have been written after his ordination, and separation from the church, to those Christians that adhered to him, and stood firm in the persecution they endured, even when he was obliged to be absent from them. If this should be thought most probable, it shews, however, the good temper of Novatus at that time, his concern for the people under his care, his diligence in his charge, and the mutual affection between him and his people; and that both he and they were odious to heathens as well as to catholics: whereas Cyprian ^f intimates, that though Cornelius when bishop was persecuted, the Novatians lived at ease; which might be the case then, and yet at some other time the Novatians might have their full share in the troubles brought upon Christians. Cyprian himself was not insensible of this, though ^g he denies they could gain any honour by it; which I shall not dispute with him at present. But whenever this letter was written, whether before or after his episcopal ordination, it does honour to Novatus. It is not the letter of a man who deserted his charge, or apostatized from the gospel, though he had retired. To all which I would

^d Præfat. p. xi. ^e Il le qualifie du nom de lettre aussi bien que les deux autres dont nous venons de parler; et il l'adresse, Au peuple qui demeure ferme dans l'évangile. [Plebi in evangelio perstanti.] Il y parle en Evêque, et dit, que ceux à qui il écrit, et dont la charge lui avoit été commise, gardoient l'évangile dans toute sa pureté, sans mélange d'aucune doctrine fautive ou corrompue, et qu'ils l'enseignoient de la même manière aux autres avec courage et avec force. Par ou nous avons lieu de juger que c'étoit depuis son schisme. Il étoit alors absent de son peuple prétendu. Tillemont. Les Novatians. Art. 3. p. 87, 88. ^f Quid ad hæc Novatianus? — Agnoscitne jam, qui sit sa-

cerdos Dei? quæ sit ecclesia et domus Christi? Qui sint Dei servi, quos diaboli infestet? Qui sint Christiani, quos antichristus impugnet? Neque enim quarit illos, quos jam subegit; aut gessit evertere, quos jam suos fecit. Inimicus et hostis ecclesiæ quos alienavit ab ecclesia et foras duxit, ut captivos et victos contemnit et præterit. Cypr. ad Cornel. Ep. 60, [57] p. 142. ^g Quamquam etiam aliquis ex talibus fuerit apprehensus, non est quod sibi quasi in confessione nominis blandiatur; cum constet, si occisi e'usmodi extra ecclesiam fuerint, fidei coronam non esse, sed poenam potius esse perfidie. Ibid. p. 143. init.

add from Mr. Jackson, who scruples not to call this story of Cornelius ^h a calumny, that ⁱ Cyprian takes no notice of this fault among all his reproaches of Novatus.

Another thing to be observed of Cornelius's letter is, that it affords unexceptionable evidence of Novatus having been ordained bishop by the hands of three bishops.

Cornelius gives a sad account of the ordination of Novatus, and of the persons and methods by which it was procured: but it ought to be remembered that, in some of the passages above transcribed, he owns that Novatus had with him for a while five presbyters and several confessors; some of whom were of great eminence, and had gained much honour by their confessions. Cornelius, in a letter to Cyprian, giving an account of the return of some of them to the church, writes, that ^k they owned they had concurred in the ordination of Novatus. From Pacian ^l it may be argued, that Novatus was ordained upon their particular recommendation: and St. Cyprian, in the letter he wrote to the same confessors, to congratulate them upon their return to the church, reminds them ^m 'of the great grief they had given him when they approved of the schism and heresy of Novatus: so that it seemed,' he says, 'as if they had left all their glory behind them in the prison.' Since then so large a part of the church of Rome, some of them men of eminence, and, in all other matters, of unblemished virtue, approved of the ordination of Novatus; and at last came over to Cornelius, as may be supposed, chiefly for peace sake, and in deference to the sentiments of the majority of their brethren; it may be questioned whether that affair was altogether so scandalous as Cornelius has represented it; and it may be justly suspected that he useth strong and aggravating expressions. Besides, Novatus and his people made grievous complaints, and cast foul reflec-

^h Pref. p. xi. ⁱ cujusmodi criminis Cyprianus inter omnia opprobria contra illum exaggerata, Ep. 57, non incusavit. Ib. p. xii. ^k — tantummodo circumductos commississe se quoque schismaticos, et hæresis auctores fuisse, ut paterentur ei manus quasi in episcopum imponi. Cornelius ap. Cyprian. Ep. 49, [46] p. 92. ^l Invenit [Novatus Carthaginensis] aliquos ex eorum numero, qui tempestatem persecutionis illius evaserant; apud quos hanc ipsam de lapsis receptis Cornelio constaret invidiam. Dat eorum epistolam ad Novatianum. Ille ex auctoritate

epistolarum, sedente jam Romæ episcopo, adversum fas sacerdotii singularis, alterius episcopi sibi nomen assumit. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 310. F. ^m Dolebam vehementer, et graviter angebar. — Posteaquam vos de carcere prodeuntes schismaticus et hæreticus error excepit, sic res erat, quasi vestra gloria in carcere remansisset. Illic enim resedisse vestri nominis dignitas videbatur, quando milites Christi non ad ecclesiam de carcere redirent, in quem prius cum ecclesiæ laude et gratulatione venissent. Cypr. Ep. 54, [Pam. 51] p. 99.

tions upon Cornelius; as ⁿ appears from one of Cornelius's own letters to Cyprian, and from divers of ^o Cyprian's letters still remaining. Though therefore every thing said by Novatus and his party might not be true, yet it is not impossible but Cornelius himself may have taken some steps which could not be fully justified. So much I think we may be allowed to say in behalf of Novatus, a man, whose faults stand in full light, recorded in the writings of his enemies; not without some aggravations and false colourings, as it seems; whilst we have not remaining one line of his in defence of himself, or against his adversaries.

What became of Novatus, after the contest about the bishoprick of Rome, is not certainly known. Socrates ^p however says expressly, that he suffered martyrdom in the persecution raised by the emperor Valerian. From Pacian, bishop of Barcelona about the year 370, we know that the Novatians gloried in the founder of their sect as a martyr. Sympronian, against whom Pacian writes, affirmed, that Cyprian had made mention of Novatus as a martyr, and having died before him: but ^q Pacian denies the truth of this, and says, that if Novatus did suffer somewhat from heathens, yet he was not put to death. Eulogius, archbishop of Alexandria near the end of the sixth century, another writer against the Novatians, speaks of a book ^r they had among them, called the Martyrdom of Novatus. But he treats it as a forgery, and shews it was false and fabulous.

ⁿ Qui [confessores] cum venissent, et a presbyteris quæ gesserant exigerentur, novissime quod per omnes ecclesias literæ calumniis et maledictis plenæ, eorum nomine frequentes missæ fuissent, et pene omnes ecclesias perturbassent; circumventos se esse affirmaverunt, nec quid in literis inesset scisse. Cornel. ap. Cypr. Ep. 49, [al. 46] p. 92.

^o —quando literis ab utraque parte susceptis tuas literas legimus, et episcopatus tui ordinationem singulorum auribus intimavimus. Honoris etiam communis memores, et gravitatis sacerdotalis ac sanctitatis respectum tenentes, ea quæ ex diverso in librum ad nos transmissum congesta fuerant acerbationibus criminosis respuimus, considerantes pariter et ponderantes quod in tanto fratrum numero, religiosoque conventu, —nec legi debeant, nec audiri. Neque enim facile promenda sunt, et incaute ac temere publicanda, quæ discordioso stilo scripta audientibus scandalum moveant, et fratres longe positos ac trans mare constitutos incerta opinione confundant. Cypr. Ep. 45, [al.

42] p. 87. Quod autem quædam de illo in honesta et maligna jactantur, nolo mireris. —Explorasse autem collegas nostros scias, et verissime comperisse, nulla illum libelli, ut quidam jactant, labe maculatum esse; sed neque cum episcopis qui sacrificaverunt communicationem sacrilegam miscuisse. —Sed et quod passim communicare sacrificatis Cornelium tibi nuntiatur, hoc etiam de apostatarum fictis rumoribus nascitur. Cyprian. ad Antonian. Ep. 55, [al. 52] p. 105, 106.

^p Socrat. H. E. L. iv. cap. 28. p. 146. B. ^q Nam quod, ante passum Novatianum, putas, et Cyprianum dixisse subjungis; Præcessit me adversarius meus; vide, quam manifeste respondeam. Novatianus nunquam martyrium tulit, nec ex verbis beatissimi Cypriani auditum istud, aut lectum est. —Porro, etiam si passus est aliquid Novatianus, non tamen etiam occisus, non tamen coronatus. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 308. G. H.

^r Eulog. Contr. Novat. Libr. vi. 3p. Phot. Cod. 208. p. 530. et Cod. 280. p. 1621.

According

p. 29.

According to his account it was ^s a trifling thing, a little book of a few pages. It may be questioned then whether there be sufficient evidence remaining to satisfy us that Novatus died a martyr: though it may be reckoned probable from the common opinion of his followers, and from the forecited passage of the treatise concerning Jewish meats, written in a place of retreat or banishment, that he was a confessor. Nor does Pacian deny this, but seems to grant as much.

II. Novatus is generally reckoned a schismatic and a heretic. Cornelius, in his letters to Cyprian, gives him ^t both these hard names: and Cyprian likewise speaks ^u in the same manner. What was his schism we have seen; what was his heresy is not quite so clear. St. Jerom, as before cited, says Novatus was against receiving apostates, though they repented. And undoubtedly that was his opinion, but perhaps not the whole of it; for, as this dispute had it's rise upon occasion of the great numbers of persons who had lapsed some way or other in the Decian persecution, Novatus seems to have extended his severe doctrine to all such; not only apostates, or those who had actually sacrificed, but to others also, who had been guilty of any slip or fault at that time.

Eusebius says that ^x Novatus excluded those from all hopes of salvation who had lapsed in time of persecution, though they gave signs of a sincere conversion and repentance: but Socrates says, his ^y opinion was, that they who had sacrificed in the persecution should not be received to communion: they should be exhorted to repent; but their pardon should be referred to God, who is able and has a right to forgive sins. And this is the principle of the Novatians; which ^z Cyprian ridicules and exposes, and Ambrose ^a condemns, and shews ^b to be extremely absurd and unreasonable.

^s κακίαν τε καὶ ἀδυσία ἡ γραμματι-
δα. Ib. p. 1621. m.

^t Ut scias quales duces et protectores iste schismaticus et hereticus lateri suo semper junctos habeat. Cornel. ap. Cyprian. Ep. 50, [al. 48] p. 94. Vid. et ep. 49. p. 92.

^u Posteaquam vos de carcere prodeuntes schismaticus et hereticus error exceperit. Cyprian. Ep. 54. p. 99. Vid. supra not. ^m p. 213.

^x ὡς καὶ ὅτι αὐτοὶ σωτηρίας ἐλπίδος, καὶ ὅτι πάντα τὰ εἰς ἐπιστροφὴν ἡγήσαν καὶ καταρτίαν ἐξομολογήσιν ἐπιτελοῦν. Euseb. L. vi. cap. 43. init. ^y μὴ δεχέσθαι τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν καὶ τὰ μετάνοιαν, ἀλλὰ ἀποστρεφέναι αὐτοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν, τὴν δὲ συγχώρησιν ἐπιτελεῖν Θεῷ, τὴν δυνάμει καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντι συγχώρειν ἀμαρτήματα. Socr. L. iv.

cap. 28. p. 245. B.

^z Atque ô frustra fratrernitatis irratio! ô miserorum lamentantium caduca deceptio!—hortari ad satisfactionis pœnitentiam, et subtrahere de satisfactione medicinam; dicere fratribus nostris, Plange, et lachrymas funde, et diebus et noctibus ingemisce,—sed extra ecclesiam post omnia ista morieris: quæcunque ad pacem pertinent, facies; sed nullam pacem, quam quæris, accipies. Cyprian. Ep. 55, [Pam. 52] p. 114. in. ^a Quid autem durius, quam ut indicant pœnitentiam, quam non relaxent; eum utique veniam negando, incentivum auferant pœnitentia? Ambr. de Pœn. l. i. cap. 1. n. iv. p. 390. Bened.

^b Frustra enim dicitis, vos predicare

This, most probably, is the true account : and perhaps Eusebius, and ^c some others, who speak much after the same manner with him, ought to be so understood likewise, though they seem to express themselves differently ; for Ambrose too charges them ^d with denying salvation to men. The meaning of those writers I suppose to be this, that the Novatians by their hard-hearted doctrine, and even letting them die out of the communion of the church, discouraged men's ^e repentance, and consequently obstructed their pardon and ^f salvation. Novatus then forbade the receiving to the communion of the church such as had fallen in time of persecution, whilst other Christians were for receiving them after tokens of repentance, suitable to the kind and degree of the offence ; some after a shorter, others not till after a longer, time of humiliation and penance ; all however who desired it in ^g the near approach of death. In this way of conceiving of this matter we are confirmed by the accounts Eusebius has left us of the epistles of Dionysius of Alexandria to several, upon the doctrine of repentance, and the various degrees or kinds of offences.

But though the controversy upon this head was occasioned by the falls of some under persecution, it is not unlikely that Novatus himself, or his followers afterwards, carried this rigour and severity to other sins, sometimes called mortal, and reckoned more heinous than others ; such as adultery, fornication, and the like ; withholding the communion of the church from all who were surprised into any of these. So say ^h Pacian, and ⁱ Socrates, and the ^k author of the Questions out of the Old and New Testament, and ^l St. Ambrose, that the Novatians did

pœnitentiam, qui tollitis fructum pœnitentiae. Homines enim ad aliquod studium aut præmiis aut fructibus incitantur. Id. ib. cap. 16. p. 413. Conf. cap. 11. p. 404.

^c —adimendo spem salutis, denegando misericordiam patris, respuendo pœnitentiam fratris. Anonym. ad Novatian. Hæret. apud Cyprian p. 16. a. Oxon. Et tu jam, Novatiane, Judicas, et nullam spem pacis ac misericordiae habere lapsos prædicas. Id p. 19. infr. m.

^d Sed quid mirum, si salutem negatis aliis, qui vestram recusatis ? Ambr. ib. l. ii. c. 4. [al. 5] p. 422.

^e Hinc ergo apparet, Novatianum cum dolo dicere agendam pœnitentiam. Ut quid enim pœniteret, si delictum aboleri negatur ? Ex Vet. et Nov. Test. Qu. cii. ap. August. T. iii. in App.

^f En, qui salutis viam fratribus inexorabili religione præcludat ! Pacian. Ep. 2. p. 309. A.

^g Ut lapsis infirmis et in exitu constitutis pax daretur. ap. Cypr.

Ep. 55. [al. 52] p. 102.

^h Tractatus omnis Novatianorum, quem ad me confertis undique propositionibus destinasti, Symproniane frater, hoc continet : quod post baptismum pœnitere non liceat : quod mortale peccatum ecclesia donare non possit ; imo quod ipsa pereat recipiendo peccantes. Pacian. Ep. 3. init.

ⁱ Εὐκταρία τῆς Καππαδοκίας τῆς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἡμαρτητοῦ ἐξέδοτο τῆς κοινῆς αἰῶς οἱ Νουατιανοί. Socrat. L. v. c. 22. p. 288. B.

^k Novatianus, majora, inquit, crimini nominatim remitti prohibentur, id est, idololatria et fornicatio post lavacrum. Qu. cii. August. T. iii.

^l Sed aiunt se, exceptis gravioribus criminibus, relaxare veniam levioribus. Non hoc quidem auctor vestri erroris Novatianus, qui nemini pœnitentiam dandam putavit. Ambr. de Pernit. l. iii. c. 3. P. 393. B.

p. 34.

not allow the church a right to pardon mortal sins, or greater sins; committed after baptism. And St. Ambrose will have it that ^m Novatus was more rigid than his followers, refusing pardon to all sins, small as well as great. Theodoret therefore says, that ⁿ among the Novatians repentance is not to be mentioned: and Cyprian in ^o very strong terms calls Novatus not only a deserter of the church, but an enemy of mercy, a murderer of repentance, a teacher of pride, a corrupter of truth, and a destroyer of charity.

This then was the heresy of Novatus; the principle by which he and his people were distinguished from other Christians: for which they arrogated to themselves (as ^p Eusebius, and ^q Augustine, and ^r Ambrose, and ^s other writers intimate), or received from their adversaries, by way of derision, the denomination of pure, or puritans.

Nor does it appear that Novatus went into any other error of moment; for Cyprian is not unwilling to allow that ^t he agreed with catholic Christians upon the doctrine of the trinity. Sozomen, the ecclesiastical historian, says this ^u was the only innovation made by the founder of the Novatian sect, not to receive penitents to communion: and he adds, that ^x they celebrated Easter at the same time with the Romans. Nevertheless, afterwards there arose a dispute among them upon this point, which divided the sect; as is related by ^y Socrates and ^z Sozomen.

I took notice just now, that Cyprian was not unwilling to allow that Novatus thought rightly about the trinity; but whether he was really orthodox, or held the Nicene faith, is another question, and a point not so easily decided. From ^a Jerom and

^m Ita nec Novatianus probatur, qui vetitum interclusit omnibus. Ambros. ib. vid. et not. l.

ⁿ Καὶ παντὶ τῶν τῆς αἰρέσεως τῆς μεταμελημένης ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν εἰς κοινωνίαν ἢ προσίτη, καὶ τῆτο μόνῳ ἐκαινοτομεῖ. Sozom. l. vi. cap. 24. p. 670. A.

^o —desertor ecclesiae, misericordiae hostis, intersector penitentiae, doctor superbiae, veritatis corruptor, perditor caritatis. Cyp. ad Corn. Ep. 60, [al. 57] p. 142.

^p καθαροὶ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀποφθιναῖον. l. vi. cap. 43. init. ^q Cathari, qui seipsos isto nomine quasi propter mundiciam superbissimae atque odiosissime nominant. Augustin. Har. 38.

^r Ut sunt doctores Novatorum, qui mundos se appellant. Ambr. in l. i. cap. 1. p. 390.

^s Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 280, p. 1620. v. 50.

^t Quod vero eundem quam et nos Deum Patrem, eundem Filium, eundem Spiritum

Sanctum, nosse dicuntur, nec hoc adjuvare tales potest. Ep. 69, [al. 76] p. 183.

^u Ναυατος μὲν γὰρ, ὅς ἀρχηγὸς ἦν τῆς αἰρέσεως, τῆς μεταμελημένης ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν εἰς κοινωνίαν ἢ προσίτη, καὶ τῆτο μόνῳ ἐκαινοτομεῖ. Sozom. l. vi. cap. 24. p. 670. A.

^x Ibid. ^y Socr. l. v. cap. 21. p. 282.

^z Soz. l. vi. cap. 24. l. vii. cap. 18. ^a Transit ad inclytum martyrem Cyprianum, et dicit, Tertulliani librum, cui titulus est de Trinitate, sub nomine ejus Constantinopoli a Macedonianae partis haereticis leſtitari.

In quo crimine mentitur duo. Nam nec Tertulliani liber est, nec Cypriani dicitur, sed Novatiani, cujus et inscribitur titulo: et auctoris eloquium, styli proprietas demonstrat. Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruf. l. 2. p. 415. T. iv. Bened.

Rufinus

^b Rufinus we learn, that the people of the Macedonian sect at Constantinople were fond of the book which Novatus wrote upon the trinity, supposing it favourable to their notion about the Spirit. And among the moderns Frederic Spanheim says, that ^c though Novatus maintained a trinity of persons in one Godhead, against Sabellius, and asserted Christ's divinity, yet he speaks in a most dangerous manner of the Spirit, as less than Christ, and a creature. Tillemont ^d says, that, in the 22d and 24th chapters of his book upon the trinity, he teaches the Son to be less than the Father, and the Spirit to be less than the Son; and that there are in him other things tending to Arianism. Du Pin ^e and ^f bishop Bull are better satisfied with the treatise upon the trinity. But enough of that matter.

The Novatians are said by several ancient writers to have condemned second marriages as unlawful and sinful, inasmuch that they would not receive those to communion who married a second time. So ^g Epiphanius, and ^h Augustine in his book of Heresies: and in another work, entitled, Of the advantage of widowhood, if it be his, he ⁱ joins them with the Cataphrygians, as agreeing with them in this respect: and Rufinus ^k upon the Creed says roundly, that Novatus, meaning I suppose his sect, forbade second marriages absolutely, and in all cases. Theodoret says this ^l was an additional doctrine of the Novatians. Socrates ^m asserts, that the Novatians were not all of one mind upon this head: the Novatians in Phrygia, he says, condemned second marriages; they of Constantinople had no positive rule concerning this matter; but the Novatians in the West received bigamists to communion without scruple. This is likely to be the truth: some had this rigid sentiment, but not all; for it being not a doctrine of Novatus himself, but added afterwards, as Theodoret assures us, all the sect was not agreed in this point. However, here we see another sin, beside apostacy, that excluded

^b Vid. Ruf. de adult. Libr. Orig. ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 253.

^c Ac quamquam in una deitate personarum trinitatem distinguit, contra Sabellium, adstruatque Christi divinitatem; tamen de Sp. S. ut minore Christo, et creatura, locutus admodum periculose est. Spanh. Hist. Ec. Sec. iii. p. 782.

^d See Tillemont. Les Novatiens, art. 3.

^e Du Pin, Bibl. des Aut. Eccl.

^f Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. x.

^g Οὗτοι δὲ ἐβόλοντο διγαμοῖς ἐπικοινωνεῖν· εἰ γὰρ τις μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα συναφθῇ γυναικὶ δεύτερᾳ, παρὰ τοῖς ἐκ ἐκδοχῆσται ἐστὶ. Epiph. Hær. 59. n. iii. p. 495.

^h Secundas nuptias

non admittunt. Hær. 38. ⁱ Aug. de Bono. Vid. cap. 4. T. vi. Bened.

^k Et quod Novatus sollicitavit, lapsis poenitentiam denegando, et secundas nuptias, cum forte iniri eas necessitas exegerit, condemnando. Rufin. in Symb. Ap. cap. 39. p. 226. ap. Cyprian. Op. edit. Baluz. p. 27. Oxon. ap. Hieron. Oper. p. 142. f. T. v. Benedict.

^l Οἱ δὲ τετὶ διαδοχῇ καὶ ἑτέρα τῷ δογματὶ προσέβηκαν· τῆς γὰρ δευτέρου γάμου ἀμειλικτοῦς τῶν ἡμῶν ἐξελκυσσὶ μυστηρίον. Hær. Fab. l. iii. c. v. p. 229. D.

^m Socr. l. v. cap. 22 p. 288. B. G.

p. 39.

men from communion; for the Novatians, that condemned second marriages, esteemed such as married a second time after baptism to be unworthy of that privilege.

And perhaps it may be allowed not to be an improbable conjecture, that this principle was borrowed from the Montanists, and therefore prevailed most among the Novatians of Phrygia; though, possibly, some few in other places also approved of the same rigid doctrine. Pacian expressly says, that ^a the Novatians made great use of Tertullian; meaning, I suppose, those works of his which were written after he had imbibed the Cataphrygian doctrine. Pacian says likewise, that ^b when Sympronian first wrote to him he did not well know what to think of him; whether he ought to take him for a follower of Montanus, or of Novatus.

It is scarce needful to observe, that they baptized afresh all who came over to them from other sects; because it seems to be a necessary consequence of their refusing communion with other Christians, as not sufficiently pure. This was the doctrine of Novatus himself, as Cyprian allows ^c plainly. He says that herein Novatus aped the catholic church.

I shall add here but one thing more. Eulogius ^d says that the Novatians at Alexandria did not pay due reverence to the martyrs, nor ^e allow that there was any virtue in their reliques. He does not say that this was the common opinion of the Novatians; but it seems to me, that their rigid principles would generally lead them to deny those who suffered in the catholic church to be true martyrs. Nay, ^f the catholics would not allow the Novatians to have any martyrs: how then could the Novatians suppose there were martyrs among their adversaries? especially ^g since they thought the church quite corrupted, ruined and destroyed, by receiving great sinners upon repentance, and communicating with them. They might likewise think

^a Tertullianus post hæresim suam: (nam multa inde sumpsit.) Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 34. E.

^b Cum primum scripseras, Cataphrygem putabam. Id. ib. p. 308. A.

^c Nec nos movet, frater carissime, quod in literis tuis complexus es; Novatianos rebaptizare eos, quos a nobis sollicitant:—Nam Novatianus, simiarum more, quæ cum homines non sint, homines tamen imitantur, vult ecclesiæ catholicæ auctoritatem sibi et veritatem vindicare, cum ipse in ecclesia non sit.—Sciens enim unum esse baptismum, hoc unum esse vindicat, ut apud se esse ecclesiam dicat, et nos hæreticos faciat. Cyprian. ad

Jubaian. Ep. 73. p. 198.

^d —φησι καὶ τῆς ἐν Αλεξανδρίᾳ Ναυατιανῆς κατὰ τῶν μαρτύρων τὴν Χρῆσιν κενολογῆντας. Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 280. p. 1617. fin.

^e Ib. p. 1620. in. ^f See before, p. 212. Note 8.

^g Nulline apud nos confessores, martyres nulli, nulli immaculati atque integri sacerdotes, quos catenæ, quos ignes, quos gladii probaverunt? Fuiere, inquit, sed negatores recipiendo perierunt.—Interim cui persuadere poteris, quod lapsis receptis ecclesia tota conciderit? quod admissis poenitentibus, admittentium populus negator effectus sit? Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 309. G.

themselves

themselves obliged to ape the catholics in this, as well as in some other matters: and, besides, the allowing this would be giving an advantage^u to some arguments brought by the catholics against their relentless unforgiving doctrine; which would be in effect yielding up their cause, and the main ground of dissension and separation.

This is said, supposing Eulogius by martyrs to mean martyrs in the catholic church, since the separation of the Novatians. If he means all martyrs in general, and such as were allowed that character by the Novatians themselves, as having suffered in communion with them, or in the pure times of the church, before the rise of this controversy; then it will be thought by some, that what Eulogius complains of may be esteemed rather a proof of the judgment and good sense of the Novatians, that they had not that excessive veneration for martyrs, which was then become fashionable among Christians.

III. When Novatus embraced the rigid principle above described, is disputed. Some think it was taken up only as acceptable to some people, and as a method of throwing hatred upon Cornelius, who had obtained the see of Rome, and was for allowing the peace of the church to such as had fallen in time of persecution, and gave proofs of repentance. So^x Pacian seems to say. And^y Tillemont argues, that Novatus did not make any schism in the church till after the election of Cornelius. But Pearson^z and^a some others have thought the schism commenced at the very beginning of 251; which is argued from some words of Cornelius in the letter formerly abridged by us; where he says that^b Moses the martyr, who^c is supposed to have died early in the year 251, had withdrawn himself from Novatus, and five other presbyters. The learned Benedictine, who writes the life of St. Cyprian, takes^d a middle way, as he

^u Plurimos comperimus se denuo reformasse post lapsum, et pro nomine Dei passos. Num possumus his martyrum confortia negare, quibus Dominus Jesus non negavit? Audemus igitur dicere, non esse his vitam redditam, quibus Christus coronam reddidit? Ambr. de Pœn. l. i. cap. 9. [al. 10] p. 401. Et Conf. Anonym. adversus Novatian. ap. Cypr. p. 17. fin. p. 18. init. Oxon. ^x Audite quæso, et totum ordinem vestri erroris advertite. Cornelius jam Romæ episcopus a sexdecim episcopis factus locum cathedræ vacantis acceperat.—Tum forte quidam presbyter Novatus ex Africa.—Romam venit.—Nec multo post, Novatianum istum episc-

copatu Cornelii anxium, (nam sibi speraverat;) cum aliquantisper, ut in tali re solet, ex sua parte fautoribus nutantem impellit, dubitantem fovet, ut magnum aliquid speret, hortatur. Invenit aliquos ex eorum numero qui tempestatem persecutionis illius evaserunt: apud quos, hanc ipsam de lapsis receptis Cornelio conflaret invidiam. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 310. E. F.

^y See Tillemont. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. St. Corneille art. 3. et note iii. ^z Vid. Pearson. Ann. Cyprian. 251. num. i.

^a Vales. Annot. in Euf. l. vi. c. 43. p. 137. a. ^b Eufeb. l. vi. c. 43. p. 245. C. D.

^c Vid. Pearson. ib. et Pagi Crit. 251. n. xiv. ^d Sic mediani inter utros-

p. 43.

says, between these two sentiments: he thinks the schism did not break out till after the election of Cornelius, but that, for some good while before, the foundation of it was laid, and divers steps taken; which I apprehend must be granted: what Cornelius says of Moses seems a good proof of it. Another argument of this may be, that the ordination of Novatus very speedily followed that of Cornelius, so that the deputies from Novatus arrived in Africa about the same time with those from Cornelius, as appears from ^e St. Cyprian, and is allowed by Tillemont ^f.

Whenever Novatus first approved the rigid maxims upon which his sect was formed, it is now the ^g common opinion of learned moderns that Novatus, presbyter of Carthage, under Cyprian, was the first author of these measures; agreeably to the passages of Jerom, Cyprian, and Pacian, which we took notice of some while ago ^h.

In January 251, say ⁱ Pearson and ^k Pagi, Novatus came from Africa to Rome, and there drew Novatus, presbyter of that city, into his measures; or, as they express it, separated him from the church. Moses, who before was intimate with Novatus, hereupon shews his dislike of him, and of five other presbyters, of the same sentiments and measures. Moses dies soon after. When the persecution abated, the disturbance broke out, upon account of the election of a bishop at Rome.

But here, in my opinion, arises a very considerable difficulty. Moses is supposed to have died at Rome in January, or February, 251, and before his death to have shewn a dislike of Novatus, and five other presbyters of Rome, on account of measures they had been led into by Novatus, presbyter of Carthage, lately arrived there. But ^l Tillemont shews it to be very probable that Novatus, Cyprian's presbyter, was yet in Africa in

que viam inibo, ut ex utraque sententia aliquid assumam, aliquid etiam resellam. Etsi enim schisma ante Cornelii ordinationem erupisse non credam, videtur tamen multo ante occultis motionibus informatam et præparatam. Vid. St. Cyprian. ap. Cypr. Bened. p. 84. vid. etiam p. 85, 86. ^e Vid. Cypr. Ep. 44. [al. 47] Ep. 45, [al. 42.] ^f Il paraît assez, que ces deux lettres furent apportées en même temps. Et c'est ce qui nous oblige de dire, que la faction de Novatien avoit commencé à se former des avant l'élection de S. Corneille, et qu'elle éclata aussitôt que l'on parla de l'élire. Tillem. St. Corneille art. 7. p. 26. ^g Et l'élection de Corneille — fût néanmoins troublée aussitôt par un schisme

tres dangereux, dont Novat fût l'auteur, et Novatien l'exécuteur et le ministre. Tillemont. Saint Corneille, art. 3. p. 10.

^h See before, p. 206, 210. ⁱ Ann. Cypr. 251. n. i. ^k Sub initio itaque Januarii Novatus, relicto in Africa Felicissimo, Romam venit, et separavit ab ecclesia Novatianum. Quare Novatianum, antea sibi maxime familiarem, Moyses presbyter et confessor illustris, adhuc superstes, sed paulo ante mortem, a communionem sua separavit, ut habet Cornelius epistola ad Fabium Antiochensem episcopum, apud Eusebium. lib. vi. cap. 43. Moyses autem paulo post moritur in carcere, hoc ipso mense exeunte. Pagi Crit. 251. n. xiv. ^l See Tillem. Mem. Ec. Corneille Art. 3. note iii.

February,

February, if not also in March, the same year. And I own it seems to me most probable that he must have been at Carthage in the month of March: how then is it possible that he should have missed those presbyters at Rome before the death of Moses?

I beg leave therefore to mention a thought, to be considered and examined by the curious: it seems to me that too much regard is paid to what Cyprian writes of his presbyter Novatus, as if he had been the chief author of all the disturbances at Rome. For the Greek writers, who appear to be well acquainted with the Novatian sect, say nothing of this African Novatus; nor does Cornelius in the fragments of his letter to Fabian of Antioch, preserved in Eusebius, take any notice of him. Indeed Cornelius, in a ^m letter to Cyprian, mentions this person among other legates in the second deputation sent by his rival from Rome to Africa; but he does not lay any thing particularly to his charge: and he there ⁿ actually calls another person author of the schism. It is apparent, from Cyprian's answer to that letter, that ^o Cornelius had never sent him any account of the conduct of the African Novatus. But Cyprian, upon the bare mention of the name of his presbyter, being full of resentment, goes into a kind of declamation; and, beside what that Novatus had done at Carthage, he tells Cornelius a story of what he supposed he had done at Rome: and he seems to think he knew this better than Cornelius himself; at the same time, what he says appears to have no other foundation but suspicion and conjecture.

I would therefore dispose things at Rome about this time in the following order: Moses died in January, or the beginning of February, 251: before his death he observed caballing, and interest-making for the chair of Rome; which occasioned his shewing a dislike of Novatus, and five other presbyters of that city. Perhaps likewise some schemes were now proposed relating to the treatment of the lapsed, which he did not approve of. After his death, and before the election of Cornelius, which happened in June 251, Novatus of Carthage came to Rome, and joined the party of the Roman presbyter of that name: and I suppose he continued to favour that interest; and he may be allowed to have fomented the dissensions at Rome. But, so far as

^m Puto Nicostrium, et Novatum, et Euaristum, et Primum, Et Dionysium illo jam pervenisse. Invigiletur ergo, &c. Corn. ad Cyprian. ap. Cyp. Ep. 50, [al. 48]

ⁿ Euaristum vero auctorem schis-

matiss fuisse, &c. Ib.

^o Nam de Novato nihil inde ad nos fuerat nuntiandum, cum magis per nos vobis debeat Novatus ostendi, rerum novarum semper cupidus, &c. Cyprian. Ep. 52, [al. 49] p. 96.

I can

p. 48.

I can perceive, there is no ground for thinking the African Novatus the first author of the Novatian rigid principle, and the Novatian sect, but the conjectural story of Cyprian, and the authority of those few other writers, who have taken things upon trust from him, without any nice inquiry or examination.

As for the exact time when our Novatus took up his rigid scheme of church discipline; whether before or after the ordination of Cornelius, and the particular occasion of it, and whether it was the result of his own serious thoughts, or whether he was led into it by views of private interest, or by the management of some designing and artful adviser; these are matters very much in the dark. I know of no remaining evidence sufficient to afford satisfaction in these points; nor do I see how they can ever be fully cleared up, unless some more of our author's own writings, or of his followers, should be brought to light, which we have no reason to expect.

IV. When Novatus was ordained he and his people were not idle or unactive, but supported his election to the utmost of their power. His deputies, as was observed before, arrived at Carthage about the same time with those from Cornelius. It is now the general opinion of learned men, that Cornelius was ordained on the 4th day of June 251; and those learned men suppose that the deputies of Novatus might come to Carthage with an account of his ordination likewise in the month of July the same year. There ⁹ matters were held in suspense for a while, till they should receive a clearer account of Cornelius's election.

Novatus sent abroad letters and deputies to many other churches, as is apparent from the epistles of ^r Cornelius and ^s Cyprian, authentic witnesses in this case. And though the churches were generally restored to peace and tranquillity in the space of a few years, as ^t appears from what Dionysius of Alexandria writes in a letter to pope Stephen, it is nevertheless certain that they had been greatly disturbed by this affair. The many epistles or treatises, written by the same Dionysius upon this occasion, are a proof that many relished the rigid doctrine of this sect. Fabius, bishop of Antioch, in particular, had been their

^r Vid. Pearson. Ann. Cypr. 251, n. vi. vii. viii. ix. Pagi Crit. 251, n. xix. et seqq. Tillem. S. Corneille Art. ii. ⁹ Sed cum statuissemus collegæ complures, qui in unum conveneramus, ut legatis ad vos episcopis nostris Caldonio et Fortunato nullis, omnia integra suspenderentur, donec ad nos eodem collegæ nostri rebus illic aut ad pacem redactis, aut pro veritate compertis, redirent. Cypr. ad Corn. Ep.

48 [al. 45] p. 90, 91, Conf. Ep. 44 [al. 41] p. 85. ^r —novissime, quod per omnes ecclesias literæ calumniis et maledictis plenæ, eorum nomine frequentes missæ fuissent, et pene omnes ecclesias perturbassent. Cornel. ap. Cypr. Ep. 49, [al. 46,] p. 22. ^s —et per plurimas civitates novos apostolos suos mittat. —Cypr. Ep. 55, p. 112. ^t Vid. Euseb. l. vii. cap 4. et Pagi Crit. 256, n. xiv. xv.

friend

friend and favourer. Marciani, bishop of Arles, was firm in the same principle and cause in the time of pope ^u Stephen: nor is it known that ^x he ever deserted them.

Besides, for keeping up their interest, there were new bishops ordained, and set over those who any where separated from the catholic church upon the ground of this principle. Of this also there is authentic evidence from ^y Cyprian himself. There ^z seems to have been a new bishop, by name Maximus, appointed for the Novatian party at Carthage, Cyprian's own diocese.

Though therefore Novatus and his principles had been condemned and rejected by most Christian bishops, and by the majority of the clergy and people of their several churches, at the time of Dionysius's writing the forementioned letter to Stephen, Novatus still continued to have a numerous party in many places, separated from the catholic church. However, we find no farther mention made of them in the third century, though that has been distinguished by Cave with the name and title of the Novatian age.

One of the canons ^a of the council of Nice, in 325, relates to them. Socrates ^b says, ' that Constantine, solicitous for peace, and desirous to secure the concord and harmony of the churches, invited Acesius, bishop of the Novatian sect, to come to that council. When the creed had been composed and subscribed by the synod, the emperor asked Acesius, whether he also assented to that creed, and to the determination concerning the feast of Easter? He answered the emperor, that there was nothing new in what the synod had determined; for it was the same that had been delivered to him as from the beginning, and from the times of the apostles; both with regard to the form of faith, and the time of keeping Easter. Whereupon the emperor inquiring, What then was the occasion of his separation from the communion of the church? he related what had happened under Decius in the time of the persecution, and gave him an account of the strictness of their severe rule of discipline; which was, that they who after baptism committed any such sin, as the divine scriptures call mortal, should not be admitted to a participation of the divine mysteries:

^u Vid. Cypr. Ep. 68, [al. 67.] ^x See Tillem. St. Cyprien. Art. 39. ^y —et per plurimas civitates novos apostolos suos mittat,—cumque jampridem per omnes provincias et per urbes singulas ordinati sint episcopi in ætate antiqui, in fide integri, in pressura probati, in persecutione proscripti, ille super eos creare alios pseu-

doepiscopos audeat. Cypr. Ep. 55, p. 112. ^z Nam et pars Novatiani maximum presbyterum, nuper ad nos a Novatiano legatum missum, atque a nostra communicatione rejectum, nunc istic sibi fecisse pseudoepiscopum dicitur. Id. Ep. 49, p. 132. ^a Can. viii. ^b Socrat. l. i. cap. 10.

p. 53^a

‘they should be exhorted to repentance, but pardon ought not
‘to be expected from the priests, but from God, who is able
‘and has authority to forgive sins. When Acesius had said this,
‘the emperor replied; Set a “ladder, then, Acesius, and go up
‘to heaven alone.”

The same story is told by ^c Sozomen, possibly taken from So-
crates. It ought however to be observed, that ^d Valefius dis-
putes the truth of this relation: on the other hand, Bafnage
^e defends it against the objections of that learned writer:

Those ancient ecclesiastical historians have not particularly
informed us of the place where Acesius was then bishop. Til-
lemont, speaking of this matter, says, Acesius ^f was bishop in
those parts; that is, somewhere not very far off from Nice.
Bafnage ^g argues, that he was then bishop of the Novatians at
Byzantium. It is certain he ^h was afterwards bishop of that
people in that city, then called Constantinople.

In ⁱ 326, Constantine made a law somewhat favourable to them,
allowing them their churches and cemeteries, provided they
had never belonged to the catholics. But ^k in the severe edict
^l of 331, or thereabout, the Novatians are joined with the Va-
lentiniens, Marcionites, Paulians, and Cataphrygians, and other
heretics: their places of worship are to be taken from them;
they are forbidden to assemble in public or private; and their
books are to be sought for and destroyed. But ^m it is the opi-
nion of some learned men, that this edict had but little effect
with regard to the Novatians. Sozomen’s reflections upon this
edict are such as these: ‘By ⁿ means of this law other sects have
‘been in a manner buried in oblivion: for in the times of the
‘preceding emperors ^o all the followers of Christ, though they
‘had different opinions, were considered by the Gentiles as all
‘one, and suffered all alike. Nor could they disturb each other,
‘because of the common calamities; for which reason, they all
‘had their assemblies without much difficulty: and as they fre-
‘quently met together, though they were few in number, they
‘were not quite broken, but kept up their several interests.

^c Soz. l. i. cap. 22. ^d Valef. Annot. p. 9. ^e Bafn. Ann. 325, num. xxxiii. ^f Ce prince fit en effet venir à Nicée Acesius, qui estoit leur evesque en ces quar-
tiers. Tillemont Les Novatians. Art. 4. p. 54. ^g Bafn. ibid. ^h Vid. Soz. l. ii. cap. 32, p. 493, D. ⁱ Vid. Bafn. Ann. 326, n. iii. iv. Pagi Crit. 326, n. ix. ^j Tillem. ib. p. 95. ^k Ap. Euseb. Vit. Const. l. iii. cap. 64, et seqq. ^l See

Tillem. as before, p. 95. ^m Vid. Bafnag. ib. Tillem. as before ⁿ Sozom. l. ii. c. 32. ^o Επὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν πρὶν βασι-
λέων, ὅσοι τοὶ Χριστοὶ ἰστέον, εἰ καὶ τὰς δοξὰς
διαφέροντο, πρὸς τὴν ὁλοκλήρωσιν οἱ αὐτοὶ ἐνομι-
ζόντο, καὶ κακῶς ὁμοῦς ἐπάσχον· σφας δὲ
αὐτῶν πολυπραγμοσύνη διὰ τὰς κοινὰς συμφο-
ρας ἢ καὶ ἡδυνάντο· καὶ διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην καθ’
ἑαυτῆς ἰσχυρὰ συνίοντες ἐκκλησιαζόν. Ibid.
p. 493. B.

‘ But ^p after the publication of this edict they could not meet publicly, it being prohibited ; nor privately, the bishops and clergy of every city narrowly observing them. From that time great numbers of them were induced out of fear to join themselves to the catholic church. And they who persisted in their particular sentiments not leaving successors, their sects died away : forasmuch as they were not allowed to assemble together, nor could they without danger teach their principles privately to any. And indeed the other sects from the beginning had but few followers, either because of the absurdity of their opinions, or the unskilfulness of their teachers ; but the Novatians having good leaders, and being of the same mind with the catholic church upon the doctrine of the Deity, were numerous from the beginning, and have continued to be so, without suffering much by this law : and the emperor himself, as may be supposed, softened it of his own accord with regard to them, designing rather to frighten than hurt his subjects. And moreover Acesius, then bishop of that sect at Constantinople, being esteemed by the emperor for the sanctity of his life, it is likely, spoke a good word for the church under his care. As for the Cataphrygians, in other parts of the empire they declined, as most others did, excepting only in Phrygia, and the neighbouring countries ; where from the time of Montanus they have been numerous, and still continue so to be.’

The Novatians suffered together with the catholics in the Arian persecution under Constantius, about ^q the year 356. Agelius, then bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople, ^r saved himself by flight : but many of his people, eminent for piety, suffered greatly at that time. ‘ The Arians,’ as Socrates ^s says, ‘ demolished many churches in divers cities, by orders of Macedonius, their bishop at Constantinople. The emperor’s edict, and the violence of Macedonius, threatened likewise a church of the Novatians at Constantinople. Its ruin was near, and the persons were at hand, to whom the execution was committed : but the Novatians prevented them after a sort ; for, gathering together in a great multitude, and being assisted likewise by a good number of well-meaning catholics, they pulled down

^p μετὰ δὲ τούτου τοῦ νόμου, ὅτε δημοσίᾳ ἐκκλησιαζέσθαι πόνεοντο κληνομένοι, ὅτε λαβρά, τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπισκόπων καὶ κληρικῶν πατριάρχων κ. λ. ib. C. ^q See Tillemont, Mem. Tom. vi. P. ii. Les Ariens Art. 63. ^r Vid. Socrat. lib. ii. cap.

38, p. 142, B. C.

^s καθὼς μὲν ἡμεῖς ἀριζοντες, μακεδὼν κληνοτες, ἀλλὰ τὴν πολλὰς κατὰ πόλιν ἐκκλησίας. Socrat. ib. p. 143. A. ^t L. iv. cap. 20. p. 570. C. D.

p. 57.

the church, and conveyed all the materials to another place without the city.' So writes Socrates. And Sozomen¹ confirms his account. About the same time the church² of the Novatians at Cyzicum was quite demolished by Eleusius, the Arian bishop of that city, an intimate friend of the forementioned Macedonius.

The Novatians however had honourable satisfaction made them afterwards. With the leave³ of the emperor Julian they rebuilt their church at Constantinople in a splendid manner, calling it now Anastasia. As for their church that had been pulled down at Cyzicum, Julian sent⁴ orders to Eleusius to rebuild it in two months time at his own expense, upon the pain of a very heavy forfeiture.

Under⁵ Valens again the Novatians, as well as others who held the consubstantial doctrine, were forbidden to worship at Constantinople. The churches of the Novatians were shut up, and their bishop Agelius was banished: but the emperor's displeasure against the Novatians⁶ was moderated by Marcian, a pious and learned man, who formerly had a military post in the imperial palace, but was now presbyter in the church of the Novatians, and had been appointed preceptor in polite literature to the emperor's daughters, Anastasia and Carosa. In regard to him therefore the churches of the Novatians, which for some while had been shut up, were opened again. Nevertheless, even after this the⁷ Novatians were not quite void of disturbance from the Arians. So writes Socrates: and to the same purpose Sozomen, who⁸ adds, that Agelius was soon recalled from his banishment, and officiated in the churches as before.

In the year⁹ 383, Theodosius had a synod, or conference, at Constantinople, for putting an end to those dissensions which there were in the empire by reason of different sects of religion. And¹⁰ Socrates says that the emperor was so well pleased with the orthodoxy of the Novatians, in holding the doctrine of the consubstantiality, that he gave them leave to assemble for divine worship in cities; and appointed that their churches should enjoy the same privileges with those of his own sentiments.

Tillemont¹¹ observes that the Novatians are never named in the laws of Theodosius against heretics, though they were put

¹ Socrat. l. ii. cap. 38, p. 144. A. B.

² Socr. ib. p. 143, D. 144, A.

³ Socrat. l. iii. cap. 11. Sozom. l. v. cap.

9, p. 601.) ⁴ Vid. Socrat. l. iv. cap. 9.

⁵ Socr. ib. et l. v. cap. 21. ⁶ Socrat. ib. p.

113, B. C. ⁷ Sozom. l. vi. cap. 9, p. 649, C.

⁸ Vid. Bafn. 283, n. vi. et Tillemont Les Novatiens, Art. 5, p. 98, 99. ⁹ Vid.

Socrat. l. 5, cap. 10, p. 269, B. C. cap. 22, p. 280, B. et Conf. Sozom. l. viii. cap. 1, p. 754, D.

¹¹ Tillem. Les Novatiens

p. 99.

in that rank in 381, by an œcumenical council. He^s adds that^h Socrates, to prove the affection which Theodosius had for this people, says, that emperor pardoned Symmachus at the request of Leontius, bishop of the church of the Novatians at Rome, about the year 388.

Socratesⁱ speaks of their sees at Constantinople, Nice, Nicomedia, and Cotiæus in Phrygia, as the chief sees of that sect in the fourth century; in the East at least, for he supposeth them to be besides very numerous in^k the West.

What were their numbers in these cities does not appear. Socrates^l seems to say they had three churches within Constantinople, beside that which was destroyed: but perhaps he means no more than that they had three in all.

The pieces written against them by^m St. Ambrose, ⁿ Pacian, the^o anonymous author of the Questions out of the Old and New Testament; the notice taken of them by^p Basil, ^q Gregory Nazianzen; the accounts given of them by Socrates and Sozomen in their ecclesiastical histories; are proofs of their being numerous, and in most parts of the world, in the fourth and fifth centuries. Not to insist now particularly on^r Philast, ^s Epiphanius, ^t Augustine, ^u Theodoret, who have written professedly of heretics and their opinions. St. Jerom likewise frequently confutes the Novatians in his commentaries, and in his epistles. Among the epistles of Isidore of Pelusium, who flourished about the year 412, there^x are two against the Novatians. And that they subsisted in some parts after this, appears from the books^y of Eulogius bishop of Alexandria, written against them not long before the end of the sixth century.

The vast extent of this sect is manifest from the names of the authors who have mentioned them, or written against them, and from the several parts of the Roman empire in which they were found. And^z Socrates mentions one Mark, bishop of the Novatians in Scythia, who was present at Constantinople with Paul in his last sickness, who died in the year 439.

The Novatians had among them some men of note and eminence. Not to say any thing more of Acefius, already men-

^s Ibid. ^h Socrat. l. v. cap. 14, p. 273, C. ⁱ Socrat. l. iv. cap. 28, p. 246, Conf. Sozom. l. vi. cap. 24. ^k l. vii. cap. 11. Conf. cap. 9. ^l εις δι τας αλλας τρεις, τοσαυτας γαρ εντος της πολεις εχουσιν οι τωι ναυατιανων εκκλησιας, συνερχομενοι αλληλοις συνιυχοντο. Socr. l. ii. cap. 38, p. 144, A. ^m Ambr. de Pœnit. libri duo. ⁿ Pacian. ad Sympron. Epist. tres. ^o Qu. cii. ap. Augustin. Tom. iii. in app. Bened. ^p Basil. ad Amphil. Can. i. Ep. 182, p. 268, A. Bened. ^q Gr. Naz. Orat. 39, p. 635, 636. ^r Philast. Hær. 82. ^s Epiph. Hær. 59, p. 493, &c. ^t Aug. de Hær. cap. 38. ^u Theod. Hær. Fab. l. iii. cap. 5. ^x Isid. l. i. Ep. 338, 339. ^y Ap. Phot. cod. 208, p. 528, cod. 280, p. 1597. ^z L. vii. cap. 46, p. 390.

p. 62.

tioned, ^a Socrates and ^b Sozomen have celebrated Eutychian as a worker of miracles; a man of this sect in the time of Constantine, who lived a solitary life upon the mountain Olympus in Bithynia.

Agelius succeeded Acefius as bishop of the Novatian people at Constantinople: he enjoyed that honour, as ^c it seems, near fifty years, dying in the sixth year of the reign of Theodosius, that is, the year of Christ 384. Socrates says of him, 'that ^d he lived an apostolical life: he went bare-foot, and wore but 'one coat, according to the precept in the gospel.' Sozomen ^e writes of this bishop exactly to the same purpose, only in different words: as before shewn, he saved himself by flight in the Arian persecution under Constantius: he was banished by Valens, but obtained a speedy release at the intercession of Marcian. Though Agelius, as both these ecclesiastical historians assure us, was a very pious person, he ^f was not a man of great abilities; however, he had under him Sifinnius, a man of fine parts and learning: he was of use to his bishop in the forementioned conference at Constantinople in 383, though he was then only reader.

When Agelius died, Sifinnius was presbyter in the church of the Novatians; and Agelius nominated him to ^g be his successor: but his people rather desired Marcian, who had been so serviceable in the persecution under Valens. Agelius complied with them, provided that Sifinnius should succeed Marcian, as he did in 395.

Socrates ^h enlarges in the character of Sifinnius. He was educated, together with the emperor Julian, under Maximus the philosopher: he was skilled in all parts of philosophy, especially in logic: he was an excellent disputant; insomuch that Eunomius was shy of entering into an argument with him, and often avoided him: he had great understanding in the scriptures: was eloquent; and had a good knowledge of the world: he was moreover a man of ready wit. Socrates, to ⁱ whom the reader is referred, has recorded some of his remarkable sayings. 'He was in great reputation for his learning, and upon that account was respected by all his successors: he was likewise 'honoured with the esteem and affection of many of senatorian 'rank: he published a good number of books: but he ap-

^a Socrat. l. i. cap. 13. ^b Sozom. l. i.

^c Vid. Socrat. l. v. cap. 12,

^d Socrat. l. iv. cap. 9.

^e Sozom. l. vi. cap. 9.

^f Socrat. l. i. cap. 13.

^g Socrat. l. i. cap. 13.

^h Socrat. l. i. cap. 13.

ⁱ Socrat. l. i. cap. 13.

ἐν αὐτῷ σισιννίου ὀνόματι πρὸς τὸ διαλεχθῆναι

προβαλλετο. Socr. l. v. cap. 10. p. 267,

C. ^g Lib. v. cap. 21, p. 280, C. D.

^h Lib. v. cap. 21. et. l. vi. cap. 23.

ⁱ Ib. l. vi. cap. 22.

‘peared too nice in his language, and affected poetical phrases; he was therefore more admired as a speaker than a writer; for indeed there was a certain gracefulness in his person, in his speech, his garb, his aspect, and every motion of his body. In a word, he was beloved by men of all sects, especially by the bishop Atticus.’ So writes Socrates.

Sifinnius died ^k in 407, and ^l was succeeded by Chrysanthus, son of Marcian, immediate successor of Agelius. Chrysanthus in his younger years had a military post in the palace. In the reign of Theodosius the first he was governor in Italy, and after that vicar of the British islands; in both which charges he behaved with great reputation. Being advanced in years, he returned to Constantinople, and put up for præfect of that city: but, instead of that, he was against his own will compelled to accept of a bishoprick: for Sifinnius, when near his end, having mentioned him as a fit person to succeed him, and his people looking upon what Sifinnius said as a law, earnestly entreated him to accept the episcopal office. Whereupon Chrysanthus fled. But the people, having found him in Bithynia, at length prevailed upon him by their importunity. ‘He was,’ as Socrates says, ‘a man of signal prudence and modesty; and by his means the churches of the Novatians were not only upheld, but increased. He was liberal to the poor out of his own estate; but ^m received nothing from the churches under his care, beside two loaves of the sacred bread every Lord’s day. Such was his concern to promote the interest of his people, that he took Ablabius, the best rhetorician of that time, out of the school of the sophist Troilus, and ordained him presbyter.’ Socrates says, that his polite and ingenious sermons were extant in his time. He adds, that Ablabius was afterwards bishop of the Novatians at Nice, at the same time teaching rhetoric.

By all these things we see plainly, that under good catholic princes the Novatians enjoyed great liberty of worship, and were admitted to places of trust and honour.

Chrysanthus was succeeded by ⁿ Paul, who had been a teacher of the Latin tongue; but, laying aside that employment, he betook himself to an ascetic life. Whilst he was bishop he was almost universally beloved at Constantinople. He died in 430. Socrates says, that ^o at his funeral he in a manner united all sects of religion into one church; for they all accompanied his body

^k Socr. l. vii. cap. 6, p. 343, C.

^l Ib. cap. 12. ^m και πρωτος τοις
πληχοις οικοθεν χρυσιον διειμιεν απο τε των
εκκλησιων υδεν εισεατο, πλων κατα κυριακην

δυο αρτης των ευλογιων ελαμβαν. Ib. p.
348, D. ⁿ Socrat. l. vii. cap. 17. init.
^o Ib. cap. 46.

p. 67.

to the grave, singing psalms, he having been greatly esteemed for the simplicity and integrity of his manners.

Cassiodorus, who wrote about the middle of the sixth century, makes mention of ^pa learned Novatian, whom he knew, named Eusebius; who, like Didymus of Alexandria, was blind from his childhood: he was exceedingly well acquainted with authors and books, as well as things, and shewed a wonderful strength of memory: he usually resided in Asia. Cassiodorus does not say any thing of his quality. Possibly the loss of eyesight discouraged his accepting any offices, civil or ecclesiastical. However, he made a good improvement of his leisure: he stored his mind with useful knowledge, and was communicative in conversation as he had opportunity.

I do not here reckon Socrates and Sozomen among the great men that have done honour to this sect; because, though they sometimes speak favourably of them, and therefore by some have been taken for Novatians, there is ^a good reason to think they were catholics.

However, from the several instances that have been mentioned, it may be inferred, that this people had among them not a few men of polite learning and fine accomplishments.

Though there were Novatians in some places at the latter end of the sixth century, or afterwards, as we have seen, yet it is probable that they declined after the middle of the fifth century, if not sooner.

Socrates, having given an account of the ordination of Cyril, who succeeded Theophilus at Alexandria in 412, says; 'From that time the bishoprick of Alexandria exceeded the bounds of the priesthood, and exercised a kind of princely authority and government; for Cyril immediately shut up the churches of the Novatians, and took away all their sacred vessels and

^p — nisi de partibus Asiæ quemdam ad nos venire Eusebium nomine contigisset, qui se infantem quinque annorum sic cecatum esse narrabat. — Hic tantos auctores, tantos libros in memoriae suae bibliotheca condiderat, ut legentes probabiliter admoneret, in qua parte codicis quod prædixerat, invenirent. Disciplinas omnes et animo retinebat, et expositione planissima lucidabat. — Hoc etiam Josephum, Origenem, et Hieronymum commemorasse in suis opusculis assererat. — Cujus instructione commonitus, multos codices antiquos reperi, qui apud me habebantur incogniti. Quem tamen adhuc Novatiana pravitate errore detentum,

miseriordia Domini suffragante, rectæ fidei credimus illuminatione complendum. Cassiod. Instit. l. v. p. 512.

^a Vid. Vales. de Vita et Scriptis Socratis atque Sozomeni; et Basnag. Ann. 439, num. v. et Tillem. Les Novatians, Art. vii. Tom. iii. P. iii. p. 110.

[†] Καὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἐκείνου, ἡ ἐπισκοπὴ ἀλιζανδρείας παρὰ τῆς ἡρατικῆς τάξεως καταδυναρκεύειν τῶν πραγμάτων ἐλάβε τὴν ἀρχὴν· εὐθὺς ἐν κυρίῳ τὰς ἐν ἀλεξανδρίᾳ ναυματικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποκλείσας, πάντα μὲν αὐτῶν τὰ ἱερὰ κειμήλια ἐλάβεν· τὸν δὲ ἐπισκοπῶν αὐτῶν διαπομπῶν πάντων ὡς εἰχὴν ἀφείλετο. Socr. l. vii. cap. 7.

‘ornaments: and as for their bishop Theopemptus, he deprived him of all he had.’

The same ecclesiastical historian, having mentioned the names of several bishops of Rome, as Damasus, Siricius, Anastasius, adds: ‘After ^t Anastasius succeeded Innocent, who was the first that persecuted the Novatians at Rome, taking away from them many churches.’ This pope Innocent ^t was ordained in 401, and died in 417.

Afterwards Socrates writes to this purpose: ‘After ^u Innocent, Zosimus governed the church of Rome for the space of two years: and after him Boniface presided in that church three years, who was succeeded by Celestinus. This ^x Celestinus also [as Innocent had begun to do] deprived the Novatians at Rome of their churches, and forced their bishop Rusticula to assemble them in private houses in some obscure place. For until that time the Novatians had flourished mightily at Rome, having a great number of churches, and large congregations; but envy laid hold of them also; the bishoprick of Rome, like that of Alexandria, having long since surpassed the sacerdotal dignity, and assumed secular power and authority: for which reason those bishops would not allow these persons to meet together freely, though they were of the same opinion with themselves: they commended them indeed for their soundness in the faith, but took away from them every thing they had. The bishops of Constantinople acted in a different manner; treating the Novatians with abundance of affection and mildness, and permitting them to assemble within the walls of the city, as has been shewn.’

Celestinus is supposed to have possessed the see of Rome from the year 422 to 432.

I conclude my history of the Novatians with these passages of Socrates, which are recommended to the reader’s observation.

V. We saw formerly a catalogue of the works of Novatus in Jerom, but not complete: for Jerom says, there were many other beside those expressly named by him. Trithemius likewise, having mentioned the same books that Jerom does, adds; ‘that ^y Novatus wrote many letters to divers persons; and that,

^s μετὰ δὲ ἀρετῶν ἰστορησίων ὅς περὶ τὸν
τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ νοβατιανῶν ἐλατύνειν ᾤχετο, πολ-
λὰς τε αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίας ἀφείλετο. Ib. cap. 9.

^t Vid. Pagi Crit. in Bar. 402, xix. 417,
iv. et seqq. ^u Ib. cap. 11.

^x Καὶ ὅτος ὁ κληρικὸς τὰς ἐν Ῥώμῃ νοβατι-
ανῶν ἐκκλησίας ἀφείλετο, καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκοποῦν-
τας ἐν τῇ πόλει κατ’ ἐκείνης ἐκπαρέδωκεν

συναγῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον· ἀλλ’ ὅμως τὴν ἐκκλη-
σίαν μεγάλην ἐπὶ τῇ Ῥώμῃ κτήσαντες, ἐκκλη-
σίας πολλὰς ἐκείνης, καὶ λαὸν πολὺν συν-
αθροίσαντες. κ. λ. ibid. ^y Epistolas plu-
res ad diversos: alia insuper nonnulla
scripsisse dicitur, quæ ad notitiam meam
non venerunt. Trithem. de Script. Ec.
cap. 44.

‘ besides,

p. 71.

besides, he is said to have written some other pieces, but he was not acquainted with them.^a

1. A very few only of those works have come down to us. We have however a small piece, entitled, *Of Jewish meats*, which is supposed to be the same that Jerom mentions. Mr. Jackson, whose edition of Novatus, or Novatian (as he calls him), I make use of, thinks this ^a treatise, or epistle, was written in the year 250, before the end of the Decian persecution: but of this, I think, we cannot be positive: for, as ^a before observed, it may be questioned whether this treatise was not written by Novatus after his episcopal ordination, and after his separation from the church; consequently, after the middle of the year 251. I allow it was written in some time of trouble, and in a place of retreat or banishment; but what was that time does not appear; whether the persecution of Decius, or Gallus, or Valerian: therefore the date of it must be left uncertain. Du Pin ^b says, it appears probable to him that this piece was written after that Novatus was become the head of a party, during the persecution of Gallus and Volusian.

2. There is also still extant the treatise, *Of the trinity*, or, *Of the rule of faith*, which Jerom calls a large volume. I think this ^c book is now generally allowed by learned men to be the work of our Novatus: and it is the largest piece of his now remaining. Concerning the time of writing it Mr. Jackson ^d mentions two opinions; the first, Pamelius's and his own, that it was written before the schism, which began in 251; the other, that of Dr. Cave; who supposed that this work was composed after the schism, not before the year 257; here being notice taken of the heresy of Sabellius, which appeared about that time. Mr. Jackson might have mentioned a third opinion, that of ^e Baronius; who thought this book was not published by Novatus till about the year 270, as supposing him not only to argue against Sabellius, whom he mentions by name, but also against Paul of Samosata, whom he does not name. And ^f Tillemont thinks this opinion not improbable, though not certain.

^a Priorem [de Cibis Judaicis] scripsit effugitante plebe Romana, cum sub persecutione Deciana (quæ exorta est Romæ anno 249 exeunte, et post annum deservit ineunte anno 251) secessisset; quod plane innuit in primo epistolæ capite: adeo ut hæc scriberetur anno 250, forte sub finem anni. Jackson. Præf. p. xi.

^c See before, p. 212.

^b Bibl. des Auteurs Ecc. Novat. p. 182.

^d See Du Pin. Bibl. Novatien. Baron. Ann. 272, &c. Tillem. Les Novatiens, Art. 3.

^e Statuendum restat (quantum possumus) quo tempore conscripsit Novatianus librum de Trinitate. Et cum Pamelio opinino arbitror ego illum hoc opus composuisse, antequam in schisma incideret, quod fuit inceptum 251. Aliter quidem judicat doctiss. Cavius, hac ductus ratione, quod hæreseos Sabellianæ meminit, quæ (ut dicit Cavius) circa annum 257, exorta est. Jackson. Præf. p. xii. xiii.

^f Baron. Ann. 272, n. xv.

^g See Tillem. Les Novatiens, Art. iii. p. 89.

Let us consider Mr. Jackson's arguments. In the first place he asks; How ^e will Cave prove that Sabellius was not known in the world for his heresy before 257? But to this there is an obvious answer at hand, that Cave is not singular in this supposition. It is the opinion of very many learned men, that Sabellius did not publish his particular sentiments till 254 or 255, or thereabout, as I have observed in another ^h place. And secondly, it is very easily proved that Sabellianism was not known long before the year 257: for in that year Dionysius of Alexandria sent pope Xystus or Sixtus the second an account of what he had said and written in that controversy, which had its rise in Ptolemais in Egypt; and therefore probably had not been on foot above a year or two, or three at the most. Therefore Sabellianism was not known in the West before the year 255, or 256, or 257. This argument needs not to be enlarged upon. I should think that any man may perceive from the history of the third century, particularly from what we have written concerning Novatianism, that, supposing Sabellianism to have appeared before 250, and allowing it likewise to have been at all different from the common and prevailing sentiment of Christians at that time, such was the vigilance of the bishops of the church, Dionysius would have sent an account of it to Rome long before 257. What a noise did Novatianism make? how many deputies were there sent to and fro? what a number of letters and treatises was there written upon that subject in the space of a very few years? I think then that Dionysius's account of the rise of Sabellianism is an invincible argument that it did not appear in Egypt before 254, or 255, or 256. Therefore this book of Novatus could not be written before 256, or 257. It is not very unlikely that, soon after the first intelligence of this doctrine came to Italy from Dionysius, or from some other person, Novatus, much disliking it, composed this treatise of the Trinity; and possibly he was as well qualified to treat the subject as any man in the West.

If this argument needed any farther enlargement, it might be added, that the catholics of Pentapolis, who disliked some expressions of Dionysius in his writings against Sabellius, laid their charges against him before his namesake of Rome, whose episcopate begun in 259; therefore Dionysius had but lately written in this controversy. If his work had been published long ago, these offended catholics would not have deferred their ac-

^e Sed quomodo probaverit Cavius Sabellium propter hæresin non esse notum ante an. 257? Hæc est mera viri docti conjectura, &c. Ib. p. 13. ^h See before, p. 72.

cusations till 259, or 260, nor have chosen to bring them to Dionysius of Rome, the ancient and honoured friend and correspondent of him of Alexandria.

Nevertheless, Mr. Jackson thinks that ⁱ the heresy of Sabellius began about 220, that is, 30 years before the schism at Rome; consequently Cave is mistaken no less than thirty and seven years concerning the time of Sabellius.

Mr. Jackson would support his opinion by the chronicles of ^k Isidore of Seville, and ^l Ado, which place Sabellius about the year 220: but chronicles written, one in Spain in the seventh, the other in Gaul in the ninth century, are of little authority against Dionysius, a contemporary upon the spot. It is likely those chroniclers mean Noetus; who might appear, or be famous, about that time: they might confound these two persons, their opinions agreeing in the main, as is supposed; and Sabellius being more known than Noetus, as we are informed by the learned ^m Augustine, who is certainly a good witness in this matter, and assures us that even in his time Noetus was known to very few, and that these two heresies were reckoned one and the same. It is an additional argument that these chroniclers mean Noetus, or confound him and Sabellius, in that they make no distinct mention of the former. There is the more reason to think Ado means Noetus when he speaks of Sabellius, because he joins Hippolytus with him: and it is generally supposed that Hippolytus wrote against Noetus in his book against all heresies, and that this was the last heresy in that work. In short, Noetianism and Sabellianism were confounded, and reckoned one and the same heresy, by the Latins in the time of Augustine and afterwards: and the best use that can be made of these two chroniclers is to confirm the common supposition, that Noetus either appeared, or was condemned, about the year 220, or soon after.

ⁱ Et tandem exhinc apparet, triginta circiter esse annos inter schisma Novatiani et inceptam hæresin Sabellii; et Cavius ratione temporis erravit fere triginta et septem annos. Ib. p. 18.

^k — hoc disertio testimonio confirmat Isidorus Hispalensis, qui in chronico ad annum a mundo condito 5419, sive anno Domini 221, sub imperio Aurelii Antonini Heliogabali scribit ortum fuisse Sabellium hæresiarchum. Ib. p. 18.

^l Huic vero convenit Ado Viennensis, quo auctore, Sabellius erat hæresiarches anno circiter 220, imperante Aurelio Heliogabalo, sub cujus imperio simul cum

Hippolyto vixisse tradit Ado. Verba illius sunt in chronico ab. an. 220, ad an. 224. 'Sabellius hæresiarches oritur. Hippolytus episcopus multorum conditor opusculorum temporum canonem conscripsit, et huc usque perduxit.' Id. ibid.

^m Sabelliani ab illo Noeto, quem supra memoravimus, defluxisse dicuntur. — Sed qua causa duas hæreses eas Epiphanius computet, nescio: cum fieri potuisse videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iste famosior, et ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæresis nomen acceperit. Noetiani enim difficile ab aliquo sciuntur: Sabelliani autem sunt in ore multorum. August. Hær. cap. 41.

Lastly,

Lastly, Mr. Jackson says, it is ⁿ not likely that Novatus should write so good a book, in all things conformable to the catholic doctrine, after he had fallen into his detestable schism, and an opinion so contrary to the divine goodness and mercy.

How detestable his schism was I cannot say, though I do not justify his conduct: for, whatever pretensions he might have to the chair of Rome, on account of his eminent learning, or uncommon services, or the expectations given him, possibly by a large number of the clergy and people of that church; yet, when another was chosen, as ^o Cyprian observes, it might be his duty to acquiesce. Nor is it unlikely that as good books as this of Novatus upon the trinity have been written by men who have had false apprehensions of the divine goodness and mercy in some respects. Finally, I wonder why Mr. Jackson should make a question of Novatus writing, at any time, a book upon the catholic principles about the trinity, when there appear not any traces of a difference upon this point between him and his followers and the catholics of that time. It is not unlikely that Novatus was from the beginning, and always continued to be, as orthodox in that, and most other matters, as Christians generally were in that age.

Upon the whole, I believe there are very few but must be of opinion that this treatise, the principal remaining work of Mr. Jackson's author, was not written till some while after his detestable schism, as Mr. Jackson calls it.

I cannot forbear observing here, though it is not necessary, that several of the ancient writers concerning heresies confirm the more common opinion of the time of Sabellianism, particularly Epiphanius and Augustine: their order is this; Noetians, Valesians, Novatians, Angelics, Apostolics, Sabellians. They supposed therefore that Novatianism sprang up in the space of time between Noetus and Sabellius.

From what has been said, the conclusion is very evident; that the earliest probable date of this work is that assigned by Cave, which is the year 257, several years after the author's episcopal ordination.

ⁿ Nec, quantum cogito, verisimile est illum condidisse tam egregium librum in omnibus catholicæ doctrinæ et pietati primæ ecclesiæ apertissime consonum, postquam in schisma detestandum et sententiam bonitati et misericordiæ divinæ adversantem se demersisset. Ibid.

^o Factus est autem Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Christi eius iudicio, de clericorum penæ omnium testimonio, de plebis

quæ tum affuit suffragio, — cum nemo ante se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus — vacaret. — Quisquis jam episcopus fieri voluerit, foris fiat necesse est; nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem qui ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem; quisquis ille fuerit, multum de se licet jactans, et sibi plurimum vindicans. Cypr. Ep. 55 [al. 52] p. 104.

3. Beside these two treatises, which we suppose to be the same that are mentioned by Jerom, there is extant a letter of the Roman clergy to Cyprian, written during the vacancy of the see, after the death of Fabian, in August 250. It is allowed that ^p Novatus drew up this epistle, and ^q it is much commended.

4. There is still another letter, written before the end of the same year to Cyprian. These two letters are among ^r Cyprian's. But it is not so certain that Novatus had the chief hand in penning this, as the former. Mr. Jackson, however, has done well in publishing it together with the other things ascribed to Novatus.

5. In these pieces there is not, that I remember, any thing concerning the particular sentiment which Novatus is supposed to have maintained after his episcopal ordination; or relating to the differences between him and some other Christians: yet surely there must have been such things. It may be argued from ^s Cyprian's letters: and ^t Jerom speaks of epistles of Novatus that were schismatical.

6. St. Jerom, in his Catalogue, among other works of Novatus, mentions two with these titles, Of Easter, Of circumcision. And, in the appendix to St. Jerom's works, there are two treatises, or epistles, without the name of the author; one entitled, Of the celebration of Easter; the other, Of the true circumcision. The former of these is now allowed to be ^u St. Augustine's, and is published ^x among his letters: as for the other, it is generally allowed to be the work of some later author than Novatus, so far as here is express mention made of the Manicheans and Arians: nor is there ^y any good reason to take it for a work of St. Jerom: it must therefore be looked upon as the composition of some anonymous writer, whose time is uncertain. I shall take notice of a few things observable in it.

^p Additum est etiam, Novatiano tunc scribente, et quod scripserat sua voce recitante, &c. Cypr. ad Antonian. Ep. 55 [al. 52] p. 102. ^q Mense Augusto exeunte clerus Romanus scribit ad Cyprianum.—Sunt autem hæc cleri Romani literæ præclare scriptæ, et literis ipsius Cypriani pene æquandæ: ex quibus de ingenio et eloquentia Novatiani judicium ferri potest. Ille enim hanc epistolam exaravit. Pearson. Ann. Cypr. 250. n. xvi. Conf. Pagi Crit. 230, n. xii.

^r Ap Cypr. Ep. 30, 36, [al. 30, 31.]

^s Sed enim supervenerunt postmodum alie literæ tuæ,—in quibus animadverti animum tuum Novatiani literis motum notare cepisse, &c. Cypr. ad ant. Ep. 55

[al. 52] p. 101. et passim.

^t — simulque epistolas Novatiani, ut dum schismatici hominis venena cognoscimus, libentius sancti martyris Cypriani bibamus antidotum. Hieron. ad Paul. Concord. Ep. 10. [al. 21] p. 17, in Ed. Bened. Ego Origenem propter eruditionem sic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum, Novatum, Arnobium, Apollinarium; &c. Id. ad Tranquill. Ep. 56 [al. 76], 589. f. ^u Vid. Martian. Annotat. ap. Hieronym. T. v. p. 175. ^x Augustin. Ep. lib. 2. Ep. 55. Bened. [al. 119. T. ii.] ^y Vid. Censuram epistolæ de vera circumcissione, apud Hieron. T. v. p. 150.

1. Here are many quotations of the books of the Old and New Testament, or references to them.

2. The author several times quotes the first ^a chapter of St. Matthew's gospel.

3. He takes notice of the ^a enrolment of Cyrenius, or Cyrenus, as he calls him, in Luke ii. 1—5.

4. He also expressly quotes ^b the beginning of St. John's gospel.

5. He cites Rom. ix. 4, 5, very remarkably in this ^c manner: *To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenant, and the giving of the law, and the service, and the promises; of whom also is Christ according to the flesh, who is blessed for ever.*

6. In this piece is likewise cited ^d the beginning of St. John's first epistle; and there are passages out of many other books of scripture, as before observed: but I do not think it needful to take any farther notice of particular citations in this work.

VI. I do not draw the character of Novatus: I am not satisfied to make such an attempt upon the ground of those few writings of his that remain, when there were so many more, and the history we have of him is so imperfect. I find, however, that ^e learned moderns do allow him wit, or good natural parts; learning and eloquence, or a fine pen: and Jerom of old, who was better qualified to judge than we are, in several respects, especially because he had more of this writer's works than we have, in a letter to pope ^f Damasus, speaking of Tertullian and Novatus, calls them very eloquent men.

The sentiment of Novatus upon church discipline is often spoken of by ancients and moderns, as contrary to the divine

^a Foris scriptus est, cum evangelista ait: Liber generationis Jesu Christi, filii David, filii Abraham. De Vera Circumcisione, ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 153, m. Foris scribitur per Matthæum: Christi autem generatio sic erat: Cum esset desponsata mater ejus Maria Joseph. Ib. infra. med. pag.

^a Rogo hic, ubi sub Cyrino census investigatio? ubi edictum Cæsaris? ubi necessitas profitendi? Ib. p. 162. in.

^b Intus scribitur, cum per Joannem dicitur: In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum. Ib. p. 153. infr. m.

^c Quorum adoptio est filiorum, et gloria, et testamentum, et legislatio, et obsequium, et promissa: ex quibus etiam est Christus secundum carnem, qui est benedictus in secula. Ib. p. 151. in.

^d Cum beatus

Joannes invisibilem et visibilem, Deum et hominem, brevi quasi charactere signaverit. Sic enim ait: Quod fuit ab initio, fratres, quod audivimus. Ecce libri illius interioriorem partem. Quod sequitur: Et vidimus oculis nostris, et manus nostræ palparunt de verbo vitæ. Ecce libri pars exterior, &c. p. 154. init.

^e Novatianus Stoicorum philosophorum scita profitebatur, homo acerrimi ingenii, multijugæ doctrinæ, nec facundie vulgaris. Admon. in Ambros. libr. de Pœnit. T. ii. p. 385. ed. Bened.

^f Non quod non potuerim et ad illas aliquid respondere, sed quod ab eloquentissimis viris, Tertulliano nostro scilicet et Novatiano, Latino sermone sint editæ. Hieron. Ep. 125. T. ii. p. 563. Bened.

goodness

P. 85.

goodness and mercy. Upon this account he has been called a man of a most cruel disposition, and has been said to charge God himself with cruelty. Nevertheless, in his book of the Trinity he appears to have had honourable sentiments of the Deity, saying ^h that God excels all other beings in benevolence, goodness, justice and mercy. Nor did he deny the power or will of God to pardon great sins after baptism; though he would not allow such a power in the church, or to be lodged with the ordinary ministers of the gospel.

I would add, that he may be thought to have one advantage, in that all his litigious and controversial writings, if there were any such, are lost: for, next to the happiness of escaping disputes and controversies, may be reckoned the having them buried in oblivion: but though this may be esteemed an advantage to him, I cannot tell whether it be so to us. It is not unlikely that, if more of his works were in being, we, as well as ⁱ Jerom, should be willing to read them. Since he is upon record, as author of a sect that subsisted for several ages, it might be desirable to know from himself the grounds he went upon. The writings of catholic authors, it is to be hoped, would afford a sufficient preservative against infection: and, together with the venom of his erroneous doctrine, there might have been conveyed to us somewhat healing and nourishing.

I have given above the true reason why I decline drawing the character of Novatus. As Du Pin saw no occasion to be so scrupulous, it is by no means fit my readers should be deprived of the commendation he has given the founder of the Novatian sect. 'This author,' says ^k he, 'had abundance of wit, learning, and eloquence: his style is pure, neat, and polite: his expressions are chosen, his thoughts natural, and his reasonings just: he is full of citations of texts of scripture, that are much to the purpose: moreover, there is a great deal of method and order in those treatises of his which we have: and he always expresseth himself with mildness and moderation.' What greater character could be desired by a catholic writer!

VII. Though the pieces of Novatus, and especially the treatise of the Trinity, or the Rule of faith, abound with texts of the Old and New Testament, there are not many books of either cited expressly and by name.

^h Quis ante crudelissimum Novatianum crudellem Deum dixit, eo quod mallet mortem morientis quam ut revertatur et vivat? Vincent. Lir. Comm. p. 335. Paris. 1669.
ⁱ et omnibus divitiis ditior, omni prudentia prudentior, et omni benignitate

benignior, omni bonitate melior, omni justitia justior, omni clementia clementior. De Reg. Fid. cap. 2. p. 24. Jackson.

^j See before, note ⁱ, p. 237.

^k Biblioth. p. 182.

1. A great number of passages are quoted out of St. Matthew's gospel. 'Him,' says ^l he, 'the ancient prophecies, as well as the gospels, testify to be the son of Abraham, and the son of David.' Here is probably a reference to the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel. The words of Matt. i. 23, are ^m quoted by him in another place. Once more: 'So ⁿ Christ himself says; *Lo I am with you unto the end of the world:*' chap. xxviii. 20.

2. To St. Mark's gospel there are very few, if any, references. However, we may take a passage or two to be considered. 'If ^o it belong to God only to forgive sins, Christ forgiveth sins:' see Mark ii. 5, 6, 7. 'God ^p is not worshipped by the belly, nor with meats, which the Lord says perish, and are purged in the draught, according to the course of nature:' see Mark vii. 19.

3. 'They ^q also urge and insist upon what is said in the gospel of Luke: *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God:*' chap. i. 35.

4. 'For, ^r *And the word, says John, was made flesh, and dwelled among us:*' John i. 14. This ^s gospel is expressly quoted as John's several times by this writer.

5. The book of the Acts of the apostles is no where expressly quoted, or very plainly referred to, in the remaining pieces of Novatus: but it may be reckoned probable that he has an eye to the history contained in the first chapters of that book when he says; 'The ^t Holy Spirit, the comforter, whom Christ had promised to the disciples, is he who explained to them the evangelic mysteries, and illuminated them with the knowledge of divine things; by whom being confirmed, they endured bonds and imprisonments for the name of the Lord, and triumphed over the powers of the world, and over all torments.' I place in

^l Hunc enim Abraham filium, hunc David, hunc non minus et vetera prædicta et evangelia testantur. De Regula Fidei, cap. 9, p. 58.

^m Et vocabitis nomen ejus Emmanuel, quod est interpretatum, Nobiscum Deus. Ib. cap. 24 [al. 19], p. 186.

ⁿ Sic Christus ipse dicit, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi. cap. 12, p. 87.

^o Quod si, cum nullius sit nisi Dei, peccata dimittere, idem Christus peccata dimittit. De Reg. Fid. c. 13. p. 97, 98.

^p Deus ventre non colitur, nec cibis, quos Dominus dicit perire, et in secessu naturali lege purgari. De Cib. Jud. cap. 5, p. 275.

^q Proponunt enim atque illa præstendunt, quæ

in evangelio Lucæ relata sunt, — Spiritus Sanctus veniet in te. — De Reg. Fid. cap. 24 [al. 19], p. 186.

^r Nam et Verbum, inquit Joannes, caro factum est, et inhabitavit in nobis. Ib. c. 10. p. 74.

^s Ac sic Joannes nativitatem Christi describens. De Reg. Fid. cap. 13. init. Si enim Joannes dicit, Omnia per ipsum facta sunt. cap. 17 [al. 25], init. et passim.

^t Hic est enim — qui evangelica sacramenta distinxit, qui in ipsis inluminator rerum divinarum fuit, quo confirmati pro nomine Domini nec carceres nec vincula timuerunt; quinimo ipsas sæculi potestates et tormenta calcaverunt. Ib. c. 29, p. 220.

the

Vo

p. 90.

the margin ^a another passage, in which he quotes the words of Joel; which are also alleged by St. Peter, Acts ii. 16, 17. See Joel ii. 28.

6. I proceed to St. Paul's epistles.

1. The epistle to the Romans is often quoted as St. Paul's by this presbyter of the church of Rome, who was also afterwards chosen bishop by a part of the same church. 'The ^a apostle Paul writes in his epistle: *Whose, says he, are the fathers, of whom is Christ according to the flesh, who is over all God blessed for ever.*' Rom. ix. 5. In the epistle penned by Novatus, sent to Cyprian by the presbyters and deacons of the church of Rome in 250, it is said: 'Otherwise ^b the apostle had not so commended us, saying: *That your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world.*' Rom. i. 8.

2. 'Lastly, ^c the apostle Paul knew this harmony and unity, with a distinction of persons; for, writing to the Corinthians, *I, says he, have planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the increase.*' intending 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7, 8.

3. 'Lastly ^d the apostle Paul: *Having, says he, the same spirit, as it is written, I believed, therefore have I spoken: we also believe, and therefore speak.*' 2 Cor. iv. 13.

4. 'And ^e in another place [the apostle Paul:] *Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.*' Gal. iii. 20. Words of this epistle are several times cited by this writer as the apostle Paul's.

5. 'Of ^f whom the apostle Paul: *He that descended is the same that ascended above all heavens, that he might fill all things.*' Eph. iv. 10.

6. 'But ^g why should we pass by that place in the apostle? *Who being in the form of God, did not earnestly seek to be like God;*'

^a Est enim per Joelem prophetam re-
promissus, sed per Christum redditus: In
novissimis, inquit, diebus effundam de Spi-
ritu meo super servos et ancillas meas.
Jo. p. 218.

^b Quod si et apostolus
Paulus; Quorum, inquit, patres, et ex
quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est
super omnia Deus benedictus in secula, in
suis literis scribit. cap. 13. p. 99.

^c Quoniam nec tantas de nobis laudes
apostolus protulisset dicendo: Quia fides
vestra predicatur in toto mundo. p. 289.

^d Denique novit hanc concordie uni-
tatem, cum personarum tamen distinctione.
Nam cum ad Corinthios scriberet; Ego,
inquit, plantavi, &c. de Reg. Fid. cap. 27

[al. 22.] ^a Denique apostolus Paulus:
Habentes, inquit, eundem spiritum. cap.
29. p. 219.

^b Et alio in loco: Me-
diator autem unius non est, Deus autem
unus est. cap. 30. p. 230.

^c De quo
apostolus Paulus: Qui descendit, ipse est
qui ascendit super omnes celos. cap. 17,
[al. 25] p. 134.

^d Cur autem —
illum prætereamus apud apostolum locum?
Qui cum in forma Dei esset, non rapinam
arbitratus est æqualem se Deo esse. De
Reg. Fid. cap. 22, [al. 17] p. 173, 174,
175. Hic ergo quamvis esset in forma
Dei, non est rapinam arbitratus æqualem
se Deo esse. p. 176. vid. etiam quæ ibidem
sequuntur, et p. 177, 178.

or, to be equal with God. Philip. ii. 6—12. That Novatus understood this text after that manner, was shewn ^e formerly.

7. 'For whether, says ^f the apostle, they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, things visible and invisible, by him all things consist.' Col. i. 16, 17.

8. There are not in Novatus any passages taken out of the first or second epistle to the Thessalonians.

9. 'The ^g apostle Paul also: Who only, says he, hath immortality, and dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto.' 1 Tim. vi. 16.

10. 'And ^h Christ is said to be one master: (Matt. xxiii. 8, 10.) but yet we read that the apostle Paul also is a master, or teacher. 2 Tim. i. 11.

11. 'Under ⁱ whom [Christ] it is now rightly said: To the pure all things are pure,—' Titus i. 15.

12. The epistle to Philemon is no where quoted, or referred to, in the remaining works of Novatus.

13. With regard to the epistle to the Hebrews, I shall take what may deserve any notice in this writer. He observes, 'It is ^k assured of Christ, both by prophets and apostles, that he sitteth at the right hand of the Father.' See Heb. i. 3. But this is so often spoken of in the New Testament, in the gospels, Acts, and epistles, that it cannot afford any argument for the epistle to the Hebrews. Again, he says, 'that ^l Christ is found to be greater and better not than one angel only, but than all the angels.' See Heb. i. 4. *Being made so much better than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.* But this too is often said in the New Testament, as Eph. i. 21; Philip. ii. 10; Col. i. 16,—18: and therefore here is no proof of a reference to the epistle to the Hebrews. Mr. Hallett, having allowed that St. Cyprian and our Novatus had not quoted this epistle, adds: 'There ^m are many passages in the epistle to the Hebrews very pertinent to the purpose of their writings: upon which account it looks very likely that they were of the same opinion with some others of the Latin church at that

^e See p. 166.

^f Sive enim, inquit apostolus, throni, sive dominationes, sive virtutes, sive potestates, visibilia et invisibilia, omnia per ipsum constant. cap. 13. p. 94.

^g Apostolus quoque Paulus: Qui solus, inquit, habet, immortalitatem, &c. cap. 30. p. 230.

^h Et magister unus Christus est dictus; at enim legimus, quod magister sit etiam apostolus Paulus. ib. p. 233.

ⁱ Sub quo merito

jam dicitur: Omnia munda mundis. De Cib. Jud. cap. 5. p. 273.

^k Aut cum federe ad dextram patris et a prophetis et ab apostolis approbatur. De Reg. Fid. cap. 26. p. 201.

^l Qui non uno, sed omnibus angelis et major et melior invenitur. ib. cap. 20, [al. 25] p. 162.

^m See his Introduction to his Paraphrase and notes upon the epistle to the Hebrews, p. 18.

ⁿ time,

p. 94.

time, who did not, as ⁿ Jerom tells us, receive this as a canonical epistle.

I infer then, that the epistle to the Hebrews was not received by Novatus as an epistle of the apostle Paul. Indeed ^o Epiphanius and ^p Jerom seem to say that the passage in the epistle to the Hebrews, chap. vi. 4—8, was the main text by which the Novatians, and even Novatus himself, had been misled. But, however it may have been with the Novatians in after times, I think there can be no reason to suppose that Novatus himself insisted upon this passage: his remaining works afford a decisive argument that he did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews: nor does the anonymous author of the piece, Against the Novatian heretic, usually joined with St. Cyprian's works, take any notice of this text. We know likewise, from the several authors who wrote against the Novatians, that there were other texts of scripture alleged by them in support of their peculiar notion: they argued from ^q the words of Christ in Matt. x. 33: *Whoever shall deny me before men, him also will I deny before my Father which is in heaven*: from ^r Matt. xii. 32: from ^s Acts viii. 22; and from ^t 1 John v. 16: not to mention any other texts.

What has been just now said is of use to shew the mistake of some moderns, who have supposed that many catholic Christians among the Latins were induced to set aside the epistle to the Hebrews, because the Novatians perverted a passage in the sixth chapter of it. Much to our purpose are the observations of Beausobre and Lenfant: 'For ^u it is false,' say they, 'that the church of Rome did not acknowledge the epistle to the Hebrews, because the Novatians abused the words of chap. vi. 4, 5, 6, to exclude from the benefit of repentance and from the peace of the church those who, after baptism, had fallen into idolatry or other crimes. There is no likelihood that the church of Rome would reject a book which had been held for canonical, because some new heretics endeavoured to make an advantage of it for the support of their errors: besides, it is

^a Hieron ad Dardan. Ep. 129.

^b *Ἐπὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους* (Heb. vi. 4—8.) Epiph. Hær. vi. n. ii. p. 494. A. B.

^c Verum ne Montanus et Novatus hic rideant, qui contendunt non posse renovari per poenitentiam eos qui crucifixerunt sibi et Filium Dei, et ostentui habuerunt, consequenter hunc errorem solvit, et ait. Hieron. adv. Jovin. l. 2. p. 195. Bened.

^d Ad Novatian. Hær. p. 18. a. ap. Cyprian.

^e Vid. Q. cii. ex Vet. et Nov. Test.

^f Sed solum alio dolo fraudem hanc velle

contegere, dicens eodem sensu etiam Petrum apostolum dixisse Simoni: Age poenitentiam ab hac malitia tua, si forte remittatur tibi, ib.

^g Unde nec illa quaestio vestra quidquam poterit adferre ponderis, quam sumitis de epistola Johannis dicentis: Qui scit fratrem suum peccare peccatum non ad mortem, petat. &c. Ambr. de Poenit. l. i. cap. 10. Conf. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 312. G.

^h Car il est faux, que l'église de Rome n'ait pas reconnu l'épître aux Hébreux, &c. Pref. sur l'Ep. aux Hebr. n. ii. p. 413, 414.

‘certain that at Rome they counted but thirteen epistles of St Paul before the rise of the sect of the Novatians; as appears from the testimony of Caius, presbyter of Rome, who wrote at the beginning of the third century: whereas ^x the heresy of Novatus, likewise presbyter of Rome, did not begin to appear till after the middle of that age.’ So those learned writers: and I think their argument conclusive.

But yet it must be owned that Philaster, who flourished about the year 380, says, ‘in his time it ^y was customary in some places to omit the public reading of the epistle to the Hebrews; and that one reason of that practice was the advantage which the Novatians endeavoured to make of it.’ Nevertheless this does not alter my opinion of the forementioned argument of those commentators. Philaster only informs us what was the practice of some churches in his time, near the end of the fourth century: as for the sentiments of the Latin Christians in the former part of the third century, and downward till below the middle of it, we need no information from him; being already sufficiently informed about them by Tertullian, Caius, the works of Cyprian, and Novatus himself, not to mention now any other writers.

7. Our next article will take in the seven catholic epistles, and the book of Revelation.

1. There are no references in this author to the epistle of St. James, nor to the first or second epistle of St. Peter. However, we shall observe, with regard to the last mentioned epistle, that he says: ‘The ^z several parts of the world are so firmly connected together as not to be dissolved by any power, till he alone who made it shall command it to be dissolved for affording a better state for us.’ See 2 Pet. iii. 11, 12, 13. Again, he speaks of the ^a world’s hastening to the fiery day of judgment: see 2 Pet. iii. 7. But this was so common an expectation, that the present world should be sometime destroyed by fire, that these expressions, in my opinion, are not sufficient to determine a particular reference to this epistle. Mr. Jackson, ^b in a note upon the

^x Or l’heresie de Novat, aussi prêtre de Rome, ne commença qu’après le milieu de ce siècle là. ib. p. 414. ^y — Et quia addiderunt in ea quædam non benesentientes, inde non legitur in ecclesia, etsi legitur a quibusdam; non tamen in ecclesia legitur populo, nisi tredicim epistolæ ipsius, et ad Hebræos interdum. Et quia et factum Christum dicit in ea, inde non legitur. De poenitentia autem propter Novatianos æque. Philast. Hær. 41. ^z — ut

ex disparibus elementis ita sit unus mundus ista coagmentata conspiratione solidatus, ut nulla vi dissolvi possit, nisi quum illum solus ipse qui fecit, ad maiora alia præstanda nobis, solvi iusserit. de Reg. Fid. cap. 2. p. 19. ^a Sive quoniam ad igneam diem iudicii mundus iste festinat. ib. cap. 8. p. 36. ^b Stoici contra (prope cum Christianis) igne dissolutum iri statuebant. Not. ii. p. 19.

p. 99.

first cited passage, owns that this was an expectation of the stoics.

2. 'For ^c John also says: *No man hath seen God at any time.*'

1 John iv. 12. Again: 'We ^d find it written, that God is called love, and that he is called light:' see 1 John iv. 8, and

i. 5.

3. I remember not any thing in this writer relating to the other two epistles ascribed to St. John.

4. There is nothing in Novatus taken out of the epistle of St. Jude.

5. 'But ^e there is a woe appointed to those who add, and to those who take away.' See Rev. xxii. 18, 19. But whether this will be reckoned material I cannot say.

8. We are next to observe some forms of citation and general divisions of the scriptures, and afterwards some marks of respect for them.

1. 'Of ^f two sparrows, saith the Lord, *one does not fall without the will of your Father:*' see Matt. x. 29, 30. 'Although ^g we hasten to other things, yet that I think ought not to be omitted which the Lord saith in the gospel for representing his majesty: *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again.*' John ii. 19. 'Lastly ^h in the gospel; *the hour cometh*, saith the Lord, *when neither in this mountain, nor at Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father.*' John iv. 21. And in like manner in other places, as may be seen in part in what has been transcribed. He also calls the New Testament in general ⁱ the evangelic scripture.

2. 'This ^k same Jesus, the Son of God, we read to be promised in the Old Testament, and observe exhibited in the New Testament.' 'Him the ancient prophecies, as well as the gospels, testify to be the son of Abraham:' see before Numb. vii. 1. 'Justly ^l do we believe and hold, according to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, that Christ Jesus is God and man.' The phrase of Old and New Testament is frequent in this writer.

3. He calls the scriptures sacred and divine, and at the same

^c Nam et Joannes, Deum nemo, inquit, vidit unquam. cap. 18, [al. 26.] p. 136.

^d Invenimus enim scriptum esse, quod Deus caritas dictus sit, — et quod Deus lux dictus est. cap. 7. in.

^e Sed vix est adficiendis quomodo et detrahentibus positum. cap. 16, [al. 24.] p. 123.

^f Ex duobus, inquit Dominus, passeribus unus non cadet sine Patris voluntate. cap. 8. p. 53.

^g Illud non arbitror præmittendum, quod in evangelio Dominus ad significantiam sue maiestatis expressit dicendo, cap. 21, [al. 16.] inquit.

^h Denique in evangelio, Veniet hora, aiebat Dominus, &c. cap. 6. p. 44.

ⁱ Præsertim cum animadvertat scripturam evangelicam, — cap. 13. p. 96.

^k Hunc enim Jesum Christum, — et in veteri testamento legimus esse repositum, et in novo testamento animadvertimus exhibitum. cap. 9. in.

^l Merito secundum institutionem veteris et novi testamenti, et Deum et hominem Christum Jesum et credimus et tenemus. cap. 17, [al. 25.] p. 128.

time shews their use and authority for confirming the truth of doctrines, or for confuting errors. 'That ^m Christ is not only 'man, but God also, is proved by the sacred authority of the 'divine writings.' 'The ⁿ divine scripture easily detects 'and confutes the frauds of heretics.' Again: 'The ^o divine 'scripture of the Old and New Testament.' And ^p sacred scriptures, ^q heavenly scriptures: this last is a common expression in our author. He ^r affirms the scriptures are infallible: he ^s says it is one and the same spirit that spoke in the prophets and the apostles: but he gives the advantage to these. Among the offices of the Holy Spirit he mentions this as one, that ^t he guards the gospels.

9. We are now to sum up the testimony of this writer. We have not seen in him passages of all the books of the New Testament commonly received at that time: but there is no reason to think he differed upon this head from other Christians; there not having been any accusations brought against him upon that account. Every one knows now what are the books I mean: the four gospels, the Acts, thirteen epistles of St. Paul, the first epistle of St. Peter, and the first epistle of St. John: most of these we have seen quoted by him; and it may be taken for granted that the rest also were a part of his canon. He likewise received the book of the Revelation: we saw a passage in him which may be supposed to refer to it. Besides, we know it was received by St. Cyprian of Africa, with whom the church of Rome held a friendly correspondence. It was also received by the anonymous writer ^u against the Novatian heretic, supposed contemporary with Novatus. This book is much quoted in that piece; which is an argument that it was a book of authority with those against whom he wrote. We perceive farther, from the writings of Novatus, that he did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as a part of sacred scripture, for he never quotes it; though there are in it many texts, which he would certainly have reckoned to be to his purpose, if the epistle had

^m Quia Christus non homo tantum, sed et Deus divinarum literarum sacris auctoritatibus approbatur. cap. 26, [al. 21] in.

ⁿ Sed enim scriptura divina hæreticorum et fraudes et furta facile convincit et detegit. cap. 24, [al. 19] p. 187.

^o Quandoquidem non tam veteris quam etiam novi testamenti scriptura divina. cap. 26, [al. 29] p. 201. ^p Scripturæ sanctæ. cap. 30, p. 229. ^q Et poteram quidem omnium scripturarum cœlestium eventilare tractatus. cap. 21, [al. 16] init.

Sed quo modo hoc tenemus et legimus et credimus, sic scripturarum cœlestium nullam partem præterire debemus. cap. 30, p. 230. ^r Non utique ex scripturarum cœlestium vitio, quæ nunquam fallunt. cap. 30, p. 232. ^s Unus ergo et idem spiritus qui in prophetis et apostolis, nisi quoniam ibi ad momentum, hic semper. cap. 29, p. 219. ^t — evangelia custodit. cap. 29, p. 223. ^u See before p. 192.

been of authority with him. As for the disputed catholic epistles, that of James, the second epistle of St. Peter, the second and third of St. John, and that of St. Jude, we have no clear evidences what was his opinion of them. He had a great regard for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament commonly received. We have seen in him many undeniable proofs of that peculiar respect which was shewn the scriptures by all Christians in general, as esteeming them books of authority, by which all disputes and controversies were to be decided. Finally, it ought to be observed, that there is not in this learned Latin writer of the third century any the least notice taken of spurious apocryphal Christian writings.

VIII. It remains only that we observe the sentiments of the Novatians concerning sacred scripture. Having before carried down their history a good way below the time of their founder and first leader, it may be thought requisite to make a distinct article of their testimony: but a short one will suffice.

1. For, as we meet not with any complaints against them relating to this matter, it may be concluded that they had all along the same canon with the catholic Christians of the several countries where they lived.

2. Philaster * expressly says that the Novatians agreed with the catholic church in receiving the scriptures of the Old and New Testament; which is not contradicted by Epiphanius, Theodoret, or Augustine, who also have written professedly of heretics and their opinions. Socrates, giving an account of the difference between the catholics and Novatians, assures us, that each side endeavoured to support itself by the authority of the divine scriptures.

3. This account is confirmed by the arguments of those writers who designedly confute the Novatians: for, in their arguments, they quote to them as books of authority all the books commonly received by Christians; particularly † the Acts of the apostles.

4. It is probable, likewise, that they kept pace with the catholics in admitting the epistle to the Hebrews. That some of them

* Novatiani surrexerunt post persecutionem postremam a Novato quodam, qui, sicut ecclesia catholica credebant antea, vetus Testamentum et novum accipientes. Philast. Hær. 82. ὅτι καὶ ἀμφότεροι παραδέχονται τὰς γραφάς, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων συγγραμμάτων αἰκιστερός ἔλεγον. Socrat. l. iv. cap. 28, p. 245, D.

† The Acts are

mentioned against the Novatians, as Epiphanius. Hær. 59, n. viii. p. 500, & Ambrosius. de Pœnit. l. i. cap. 8. p. 399, E. cap. 10, p. 403, B. C. Quid Paulus apostolus? erubescit, cum Atheniensem illum versum et dixit et comprobavit? Nam in Actis apostolorum ita ponit, &c. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 308. B. C. Vid. etiam Qu. ex V. et N. T. Qu. cii.

in some places received this epistle, may be inferred from the passages of Epiphanius and Jerom before quoted: and St. Ambrose, in his books upon this controversy, considers ^a the objection taken from Hebr. vi. 4,—8, as does ^b Eulogius of Alexandria; who likewise says that ^c they argued from Hebr. x. 26, 27: but I do not observe that Pacian, or the anonymous author of the Questions out of the Old and New Testament, in writing against this sect, take any notice of the objection founded upon the passage in the sixth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews. It is therefore my opinion, that, whilst the catholics were not agreed in receiving this epistle, so long there were also different sentiments about it among the Novatians.

5. I can say little concerning the opinion which these people had about the disputed catholic epistles.

6. As for the book of the Revelation, it was certainly received by them: it is quoted by most, if not all, the authors who write against them.

^a Cum igitur tam evidenti et ipsius apostoli, et scriptorum ejus exemplo redarguantur, tamen adhuc obniti volunt, et auctoritatem aiunt apostolicæ sibi suffragari sententiæ, allegantes scriptum ad Hæbræos:

Impossible enim, &c. Ambr. de Pœnit. l. ii. cap. 2. p. 417. C. D.

^b Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 280. p. 1604.

^c Ib. p. 1609. in.

A NOTE UPON CHAP. XLVII.

It is commonly said, by learned moderns, that the Greek writers of the church have mistaken the name of Cornelius's rival, calling him Novatus *, and confounding this presbyter of Rome with the presbyter of Carthage: whereas his name, they say, was Novatianus, or Novatian. So Cave and Ruinart, and Petavius, not to mention any more. Hosce duos nominum similitudine decepti perpetuo fere confundunt scriptores Græci. *Cav. H. L. in Novatian.* Quin et ad ipsum Novatianum, quem Eusebius Novatum vocat, Græcorum more, qui Novati et Novatiani nomina sæpius confundunt. *Ruin. AÆ. M. Sinc. et Sel. de S. Dionys. Alex. n. vii. p. 180.* Græci enim Novatum et Novatianum inter se confuderunt, similitudine nominum decepti. Quo in errore fuit Eusebius noster. *Vales. Annot. in Euseb. l. vi. c. 45.*

1. My first argument therefore in support of the present assertion is, that this presbyter of Rome is generally called Novatus by the Greek writers; by Eusebius, and Socrates, and Sozomen, and divers others: and I know of no reason why they should be deceived herein. Eusebius had before him the letter of Cornelius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, and the letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to this presbyter, and divers other letters of the same Dionysius, upon the controversy about receiving the lapsed: and the two last mentioned ecclesiastical historians were well acquainted with the Novatians at Constantinople,

* See note A, page 106.

who

who may be supposed to have known the name of the founder of their sect. Let me add here, to all the Greek writers already mentioned, Athanasius; who expressly says, that the Novatians were so called from Novatus: *απο νοβατη νοβατιανων* Orat. i. contr. Ar. p. 407. B.

2. There are still remaining in Latin authors traces of their agreement with the Greek writers upon this head. For this I allege the words of J. A. Fabricius: Eusebii et Rufini editiones *νοβατω*, Novato vi. 45. Sed Novatiano utique fuit illi nomen, non Novato, qui episcopum Romanum se contra Cornelium ordinari passus est anno 251, quo has ad eum literas Dionysius Alexandrinus exaravit. *Fabric. not. (V) ad Hieron. de V. I. cap. 69.* Rufinus therefore, in his translation of Eusebius, at the place referred to, has Novatus, as Fabricius owns. I shall next allege a passage taken from the notes of the Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose's works: Romana editio ubique Novatum fecit & Novatiano: qua mutatione inductus in errorem Petavius Ambrosium nostrum iis patribus a quibus ambo hæresiarchæ inter se confunduntur, accensuit. Verum doctissimus vir secus sensitset, si quam aliam editionem, aut quemlibet manu exaratum codicem consulisset. *Not. in Ambros. de Pœnit. l. i. cap. 3, p. 393.* Hence then I learn, that in the Roman edition of St. Ambrose's works is Novatus, where in other editions we now have Novatianus. Indeed the Benedictine editors of Ambrose say, that all the manuscripts have Novatianus. But, in answer to this, two things may be said: 1. That it is likely the Roman editor did not put Novatus without some reason. 2. It is very likely that in some manuscripts of divers Latin authors the name of the presbyter of Rome may be found written Novatus: and what is to to be farther offered will confirm this supposition. I therefore proceed in the second argument. The Benedictines themselves have so printed his name in their edition of St. Hilary of Poitiers: Nam in urbe Roma sub Novato et Sabellio et Valentino hæreticis factum concilium, ab Orientalibus confirmatum est. *Hilar. ex. op. hist. Fragm. iii. p. 1320. F. Et vid. ibidem annotata.* Farther, I find his name frequently printed Novatus in the edition of St. Jerom's works by Martianay, a Benedictine likewise, of the congregation of St. Maur. Quid respondebit Novatus negans pœnitentiam, &c.? *Hieron. Comm. in Joel. cap. 2. p. 1358. in Tom. iii.* Hæc diximus, non quo juxta Novatum tollamus spem pœnitentiæ. *Id. in Amos, cap. 5. p. 1407. m.* Faceffat itaque Novatus errantibus manus non porrigens.—*Id. in Ep. 38, [al. 61] T. iv. p. 307.* Ego Originem propter eruditionem sic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum, Novatum, Arnobium, &c. *Ep. 56, [al. 76] p. 589. ib.* Verum ne Montanus et Novatus hic rideant, &c. *adv. Jovin. l. 2. p. 195. m.* Non est loci hujus, ut pœnitentiam prædicem, et quasi contra Montanum Novatumque scribens, dicam, &c. *ad Occan. Ep. 84. [al. 30] p. 659.* Montanus et qui Novati schiima sectantur, nomen sibi munditiæ præsumsere. *In Ep. ad Tit. cap. 1. p. 414. f.* I have put down all these passages out of Martianay's edition of Jerom's works, hoping I may rely upon him for the right readings. I observe, indeed, that, in the index of matters at the end of St. Jerom's fourth tome, Martianay distinguishes between Novatian, and Novatus the presbyter of Carthage; supposing that where Jerom mentions Novatus he intends this last person,

Catholicus de humilitate et obedientia. *Vit. Montf. Bib. Mss. T. i. p. 46, 67, 1373**. This consideration alone is sufficient to render it probable that the person of whom we are speaking was called Novatus: for it is not likely he should have a name by which no other man was ever called.

5. Some learned moderns seem to have supposed that the name of this person was Novatus. I guess that Beaufobre and Lenfant were of this opinion, because they write his name in French Novat: as may be seen in a passage formerly quoted, p. 244, note *. In Du Fresno's Latin translation of the Paschal Chronicle, the name Novatus is preserved. p. 271, D. 272. A Paris. 1688. And I am apt to think it will be found, (though this single instance only now offers itself to me,) that several learned moderns have kept the name Novatus in their Latin translations of Greek writers.

Obj. I can think of but one objection of moment, which is, that this person's name is always written Novatian by St. Cyprian: and it must be owned that this is a considerable difficulty: nevertheless, I think it ought not to prevail against so much evidence as we have seen on the other side. The case seems to me to be this; Cyprian would have it that his presbyter Novatus was the principal author of the disturbances at Rome, [See before, p. 222.] And therefore he called the presbyter of Rome Novatian, as if he had been only a follower of Novatus of Carthage: and, having once given him that name, he used it ever after. Moreover, having occasion, or being of himself mightily disposed, frequently to mention these two presbyters together, no shorter way of distinguishing them could be thought of, than to call one Novatus, the other Novatianus: and St. Cyprian having often called him of Rome Novatian, I suppose he was without scruple followed by many Latin writers; though, I think, not universally; far from it: for we have seen above sufficient evidence that, notwithstanding Cyprian's way of writing, there were not a few ancient Latin authors, who always, or generally, called the presbyter of Rome, and Cornelius's rival, Novatus.

It will be thought by some that I have dwelt too long upon so trifling a thing as a man's name: but, having long ago had doubts about it, I have chosen to put down here the collections I had made upon the point. Let others make what use of them they think fit.

* So I wrote in the first edition: but the book is easy enough to be found. It is in Bib. PP. Maxima, T. v. p. 1082, 1083, where it makes little more than one folio page. It is also in Bib. PP. Morell. Paris, 1644, T. ii. p. 75, &c.

C H A P. XLVIII.

DIONYSIUS, bishop of Rome.

- I. *His history and works.* II. *His character.* III. *His testimony to the scriptures.*

I. DIONYSIUS of Rome has been already mentioned by us in the history of his contemporary and namesake of Alexandria. He ^a was first presbyter, afterwards bishop of Rome. His predecessor Xystus, or Sixtus the second, suffered martyrdom ^b under the emperors Valerian and Gallienus, on the sixth day of August, in the year of Christ 258. It is now the general opinion ^c of learned men that, after the death of Xystus, the see of Rome was vacant almost a whole year, that Dionysius was ordained bishop of that city on the 22d day of July 259, and died the 26th of December 269.

In the time of his episcopate, probably near the beginning of the sole reign of Gallienus, not long after the defeat of Valerian by the Persians, and therefore about the year of our Lord 260 or 261, the Christians at Cæsarea in Cappadocia were in great distress; occasioned, as it seems, by the inroads of some barbarous people: for St. Basil ^d in one of his epistles says, ‘ that Dionysius wrote to the church of Cæsarea, and by his letters comforted them when under affliction, and likewise sent some persons to redeem those of the brethren that had been taken captive.’ The memory of this benefit, St. Basil says, was preserved at Cæsarea, not only by the tradition of their ancestors, but also by the letter of that good bishop in their possession.

He was appealed to in the affair of Sabellianism, and probably in the beginning of his episcopate, in ^e the year 260, or soon

^a Vid. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 7. p. 254, A. Denys Pape.

^b Xystum autem in cœmeterio animadversum sciatz octavo iduum Augustarum die. Cypr. Ep. 80, [al. 82] p. 238. Jain de Xysto bono et pacifico sacerdote, ac propterea beatissimo martyre, ab urbe nuntius venerat. Pont. de Vit. Cyprian. p. 8. m. Sixti martyris, et Romanæ ecclesiæ episcopi. Hieron. ad Ctesiph. Ep. 43, p. 476, fin. Bened.

^c Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. Pagi Crit. in Baron. 258, n. vii. 271, n. x. Basnag. Ann. 259, n. viii. Tillem. Mem. T. iv. St.

^d Οὐδαμὴν γὰρ, μητρὸς ἀκολούθῳ, πατρὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἀντιθέτων, καὶ ἀπὸ γραμμάτων τῶν ἐν καὶ ἐν πεφύλαχμένων παρ’ ἡμῶν, διδασκομένοι, Διονύσιον ἐκεῖνον, τοῦ μακαριωτάτου ἐπισκοποῦ, — ἐπισκεπτομένου διὰ γραμμάτων τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐκκλησίαν τῶν καίσαρων, καὶ παρακαλῶντα τῆς πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ γραμμάτων, καὶ τιμῶν τῆς ἀπολυτρώμενης ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας τῆς ἀδελφότητά. Basil. Ep. 70, [al. 220] T. iii. p. 164, B. C. Bened.

^e Vid. Basnag. Ann. 259, n. viii.

after.

after. 'Some catholics of Pentapolis,' as Athanasius ^f writes, 'dissatisfied with some expressions used by Dionysius of Alexandria in his writings upon that argument, went to Rome, and accused him there to his namesake Dionysius, bishop of Rome: and he, having heard them, wrote at once against the followers of Sabellius, and against those opinions for which Arius has been expelled the church; declaring, that the opinions of Sabellius, and of those who say the Word of God is a creature, a workmanship, and made, though directly opposite to each other, were equally impious. He also wrote to Dionysius, to inform him of the things laid to his charge; who immediately replied, entitling his books, A confutation and apology.' So writes Athanasius in his epistle concerning the opinion of Dionysius of Alexandria. In another work he says; 'When some brought accusations to the bishop of Rome against the bishop of Alexandria, as if he had said the Son was a creature, and not consubstantial to the Father, the synod at Rome was offended, and the bishop of Rome sent the judgment of them all to his namesake. He afterwards vindicated himself, entitling his book, A confutation and apology: and thus he writes to him;' that is, to Dionysius of Rome.

There was therefore a synod at Rome, which had some concern in this business: but, whether it was convened upon occasion of the accusations brought against Dionysius of Alexandria, or whether his accusers found it assembled, and laid their charges against him before Dionysius of Rome, and the whole synod, is not clear. Hence also we perceive that Dionysius of Rome wrote in that controversy; but whether one piece only, or a treatise, and an epistle besides to Dionysius of Alexandria, is not certain. A large fragment of what he wrote upon this point remains cited in a work of Athanasius. I shall transcribe a part of it presently.

It should be observed, that Dionysius, whilst presbyter only, wrote to his namesake of Alexandria upon the question of the baptism of heretics. And now, I think, we have mentioned all

^f — ἀληθὸς ἐκ τῆς Ρώμης, καὶ κατεῖχε καὶ αὐτὴν παρὰ τῷ ὁμωνύμῳ αὐτοῦ Διονυσίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης· κακίως ἀκούσας, ἐγράφη ὁμὴ καὶ αὐτῶν τὰ σαβελλιανὰ δοξαζόντων, καὶ κατὰ τῶν φρονητῶν ταῦτα ἀπερ καὶ φρενὸς λεγὼν ἐξεβλήθη τῆς ἐκκλησίας· — ἐπετίθει δὲ καὶ Διονυσίῳ δηλῶσαι, περὶ ὧν εἰρηκασί κατ' αὐτὴν· καὶ ἀντεγράψαι εὐθύς αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐπεγράψαι τὰ βιβλία ἐλεγχῆ καὶ ἀπολογίας. Athan. de Sent. Dionys. T. i. p. 252.

^g ΑΛΛΑ ΤΙΝΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΣΤΑΣΕΩΝ

παρὰ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης τοῦ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπου, ὡς λεγοῖται ποιεῖν, καὶ μὴ ἐμοῦσιον τοῦ υἱοῦ τῷ πατρὶ, ἢ μὲν κατὰ Ῥώμην συνοδὸς κηρυκτικῆς, ὁ δὲ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπισκοπὸς τῆς παύλων γυναικὸς γραφῆναι πρὸς τοῦ ὁμωνύμου αὐτοῦ. κακίως λοιπὸν ἀπολογημένος τοῦ μὲν βιβλίου ἐπιγράψαι ἐλεγχῆ καὶ ἀπολογίας. γραφῆναι δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτοῦ. Athan. de Synodis, p. 757, F.

^h Vid. Euf. lib. vii. cap. 5, p. 250, C.

the works of this bishop of Rome, of which we have any certain notice: I mean the letter just named, the letter to the Cæsareans mentioned by Basil, and what he wrote in the Sabellian controversy: for Jerom has not allotted him any distinct article in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers: and as for decretal, or other epistles ascribed to him, they are allowed ⁱ by learned men to be spurious: nor does there remain any thing of his genuine writings, beside the fragment just mentioned.

To this Dionysius was sent one of the letters about baptism, written by Dionysius of Alexandria, as ^k shewn formerly; as also another letter by the same person concerning one ^l Lucian. To him likewise were ^m addressed the four books concerning Sabellianism, written by the same Dionysius of Alexandria, as we are assured by Eusebius; with whom Athanasius agrees when he says, the vindication which that bishop made of himself, entitled, A confutation and apology, was inscribed to Dionysius of Rome. And lastly, to him, and Maximus, bishop of Alexandria, by name, as well as to all other bishops and clergy, and the universal church, was directed ⁿ the Synodical epistle of the council of Antioch, which condemned Paul of Samosata: but Dionysius dying before the end of the year 269, he never saw it: and possibly he was dead at the time of writing it, though the fathers of the council had not received any account of his death.

II. We are not without proofs of the eminence and distinction of this bishop for his personal merit, as well as the dignity of his see. His epistolary correspondence and friendship, whilst yet presbyter only, with the great Dionysius of Alexandria, is an argument he was a man of more than common accomplishments. Eusebius, who read the fourth letter of the Alexandrian bishop upon baptism, which we have not, observes, that from the testimony there given him it may be perceived that ^o Dionysius of Rome was a very learned and admirable man. Basil, in the place before quoted, styles him ^p 'a most blessed bishop, illustrious for the orthodoxy of his faith, and every other virtue:' and he ^q elsewhere mentions him together with Irenæus, Clement of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria, and other ancient eccle-

ⁱ Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. 269, n. iii. Basil. 259, n. ix. Tillem. Mem. St. Denys Papæ. p. 701, 702.

^k See before, ch.

xlili. n. vi. p. 70.

^l See the same,

ibid.

^m See the same, numb. vii. p.

71.

ⁿ Vid. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 30. init.

^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{jj} ^{jk} ^{jl} ^{jm} ^{jn} ^{jo} ^{jp} ^{jq} ^{jr} ^{js} ^{jt} ^{ju} ^{jv} ^{jw} ^{jx} ^{ky} ^{kz} ^{la} ^{lb} ^{lc} ^{ld} ^{le} ^{lf} ^{lg} ^{lh} ^{li} ^{lj} ^{lk} ^{ll} ^{lm} ^{ln} ^{lo} ^{lp} ^{lq} ^{lr} ^{ls} ^{lt} ^{lu} ^{lv} ^{lw} ^{lx} ^{ly} ^{lz} ^{ma} ^{mb} ^{mc} ^{md} ^{me} ^{mf} ^{mg} ^{mh} ^{mi} ^{mj} ^{mk} ^{ml} ^{mm} ^{mn} ^{mo} ^{mp} ^{mq} ^{mr} ^{ms} ^{mt} ^{mu} ^{mv} ^{mw} ^{mx} ^{my} ^{mz} ^{na} ^{nb} ^{nc} nd ^{ne} ^{nf} ^{ng} ^{nh} ⁿⁱ ^{nj} ^{nk} ^{nl} ^{nm} ⁿⁿ ^{no} ^{np} ^{nq} ^{nr} ^{ns} ^{nt} ^{nu} ^{nv} ^{nw} ^{nx} ^{ny} ^{nz} ^{oa} ^{ob} ^{oc} ^{od} ^{oe} ^{of} ^{og} ^{oh} ^{oi} ^{oj} ^{ok} ^{ol} ^{om} ^{on} ^{oo} ^{op} ^{oq} ^{or} ^{os} ^{ot} ^{ou} ^{ov} ^{ow} ^{ox} ^{oy} ^{oz} ^{pa} ^{pb} ^{pc} ^{pd} ^{pe} ^{pf} ^{pg} ^{ph} ^{pi} ^{pj} ^{pk} ^{pl} ^{pm} ^{pn} ^{po} ^{pp} ^{pq} ^{pr} ^{ps} ^{pt} ^{pu} ^{pv} ^{pw} ^{px} ^{py} ^{pz} ^{qa} ^{qb} ^{qc} ^{qd} ^{qe} ^{qf} ^{qg} ^{qh} ^{qi} ^{qj} ^{qk} ^{ql} ^{qm} ^{qn} ^{qo} ^{qp} ^{qq} ^{qr} ^{qs} ^{qt} ^{qu} ^{qv} ^{qw} ^{qx} ^{qy} ^{qz} ^{ra} ^{rb} ^{rc} rd ^{re} ^{rf} ^{rg} ^{rh} ^{ri} ^{rj} ^{rk} ^{rl} ^{rm} ^{rn} ^{ro} ^{rp} ^{rq} ^{rr} ^{rs} ^{rt} ^{ru} ^{rv} ^{rw} ^{rx} ^{ry} ^{rz} ^{sa} ^{sb} ^{sc} ^{sd} ^{se} ^{sf} ^{sg} ^{sh} ^{si} ^{sj} ^{sk} ^{sl} sm ^{sn} ^{so} ^{sp} ^{sq} ^{sr} ^{ss} st ^{su} ^{sv} ^{sw} ^{sx} ^{sy} ^{sz} ^{ta} ^{tb} ^{tc} ^{td} ^{te} ^{tf} ^{tg} th ^{ti} ^{tj} ^{tk} ^{tl} tm ^{tn} ^{to} ^{tp} ^{tq} ^{tr} ^{ts} ^{tu} ^{tv} ^{tw} ^{tx} ^{ty} ^{tz} ^{ua} ^{ub} ^{uc} ^{ud} ^{ue} ^{uf} ^{ug} ^{uh} ^{ui} ^{uj} ^{uk} ^{ul} ^{um} ^{un} ^{uo} ^{up} ^{uq} ^{ur} ^{us} ^{ut} ^{uu} ^{uv} ^{uw} ^{ux} ^{uy} ^{uz} ^{va} ^{vb} ^{vc} ^{vd} ^{ve} ^{vf} ^{vg} ^{vh} ^{vi} ^{vj} ^{vk} ^{vl} ^{vm} ^{vn} ^{vo} ^{vp} ^{vq} ^{vr} ^{vs} ^{vt} ^{vu} ^{vv} ^{vw} ^{vx} ^{vy} ^{vz} ^{wa} ^{wb} ^{wc} ^{wd} ^{we} ^{wf} ^{wg} ^{wh} ^{wi} ^{wj} ^{wk} ^{wl} ^{wm} ^{wn} ^{wo} ^{wp} ^{wq} ^{wr} ^{ws} ^{wt} ^{wu} ^{wv} ^{ww} ^{wx} ^{wy} ^{wz} ^{xa} ^{xb} ^{xc} ^{xd} ^{xe} ^{xf} ^{xg} ^{xh} ^{xi} ^{xj} ^{xk} ^{xl} ^{xm} ^{xn} ^{xo} ^{xp} ^{xq} ^{xr} ^{xs} ^{xt} ^{xu} ^{xv} ^{xw} ^{xx} ^{xy} ^{xz} ^{ya} ^{yb} ^{yc} ^{yd} ^{ye} ^{yf} ^{yg} ^{yh} ^{yi} ^{yj} ^{yk} ^{yl} ^{ym} ^{yn} ^{yo} ^{yp} ^{yq} ^{yr} ^{ys} ^{yt} ^{yu} ^{yv} ^{yw} ^{yx} ^{yy} ^{yz} ^{za} ^{zb} ^{zc} ^{zd} ^{ze} ^{zf} ^{zg} ^{zh} ^{zi} ^{zj} ^{zk} ^{zl} ^{zm} ^{zn} ^{zo} ^{zp} ^{zq} ^{zr} ^{zs} ^{zt} ^{zu} ^{zv} ^{zw} ^{zx} ^{zy} ^{zz}

στος λογος τε και θαυμασιος προς τε κατ' Αλεξανδριαν Διονυσιν μεμαρτυρηται. Euf. l. vii. c. 7. fin. P Διονυσιον εκεινον, τον μακαριστατον επισκοπον, παρ' υμιν επι ορθοτης πισweis, και τη λοιπη αρετη διατρεψαντα. Basil. ut supra.

^q Ειρηναιος εκεινος, και Κλημης ο Ρωμαιος,

255 *Credibility of the Gospel History.* Part II. Ch. XLVIII. vol. 5. p. 115.
 fistical writers of chief note. I need not insist any farther upon
 the regard which Athanasius has shewn him.

III. However, I am now to transcribe from Athanasius a part of
 the fragment of this bishop of Rome, which he has preserved:
 It will represent to us his respectful manner of speaking of the
 scriptures in general: and it contains quotations out of some
 books of the New Testament.

‘The true disciples of Christ,’ says ‘Dionysius, ‘know very
 ‘well that a trinity is taught by the divine scriptures; but that
 ‘neither the Old nor the New Testament teach three Gods.’
 Afterwards: ‘But^s the Son always was, if he is in the Father, as
 ‘he himself says: (John xiv. 11.) and if Christ be his word
 ‘and wisdom and power, as ye know the divine scriptures say,
 ‘Christ is.’ He argues: ‘Was^t he made, who is the first-
 ‘begotton of every creature?’ Col. i. 15. ‘He observes, that^u in
 ‘many places the divine oracles say Christ was begotten; no
 ‘where that he was made.’ Finally, at the conclusion of the
 fragment: ‘For^x I,’ says he, ‘and the Father are one.’ And,
 ‘I in the Father, and the Father in me.’ John x. 30. xiv. 10, 11.

This is all I have to produce from Dionysius: though it be
 little, it suffices to shew the concurrence of this bishop of Rome
 with other Christians of that time in acknowledging the divine
 scriptures, and divine oracles, to be the rule of faith by which all
 doctrines were to be tried. He likewise, as well as others,
 teaches us where these oracles are to be found; namely, in the
 Old and New Testament, which contain all the scriptures that
 were in the strictest sense sacred and divine.

και Διονυσιος ο Ρωμαιος, κ. λ. Id. de Sp. S.
 cap. 29, p. 60, Bened.

Ουτοι γαρ
 τριαδα μιν κηρυττομενην υπο της θειας γραφης
 σαφως επιγινανται, τρεις δε Θεος οτε παλαιαν
 οτε καινην διαθηκην κηρυττισαν. ap Ath. de
 Decret. Nicen. Syn. T. i. p. 231, F. Bened.

αις δε νυν, ει γε εν τω πατρι εστιν, ως αυτος
 φησι^s και ει λογος και σοφια και δυναμις ο
 Χριστος ταυτα γαρ ειπαι τον Χριστον αι θειαι

λεγουσι γραφαι, ως περ επιγασθη. ib. p. 232.
 Α.

Ποιημα ο πρωτοτοκος πασης
 κτισως—; ib. D. και πολλαχη δι
 των θειων λογων γενησθαι,—λεγομεναι—
 κ. λ. ibid.

Εγω γαρ, φησι, και ο πατηρ εν ισμι^s
 και εγω εν τω πατρι, και ο πατηρ εν ιμω^s
 ibid. E.

CHAP.

I. Hi

I. C

to hav
 the fou
 rary w
 all men
 of the
 of Ecc
 bottom

He
 Christ
 quite t
 there a
 us to t
 made b
 to have

It is
 of Afr
 pears fr
 It ma

* They
 Commodi
 tions of h
 Cav. Hist.
 De Verit.
 ue of Dav
 cius Felix.

* Comm
 Sacras etia
 cepit fidei.
 volens aliq
 offerre Chr
 mediocri se
 verum Pag
 ram attige
 egitruere
 amare. U
 bus adverf

Vol.

C H A P XLIX.

COMMODIAN.

- I. *His history and work.* II. *Select passages.* III. *His testimony to the scriptures.*

I. COMMODIAN, a Latin author, formerly supposed by some to have lived in the time of Constantine, near the beginning of the fourth century, now ^a with more reason reckoned contemporary with St. Cyprian, or to have lived soon after him, is not at all mentioned by St. Jerom. As Gennadius, who wrote near the end of the fifth century, has given Commodian a place in his book of Ecclesiastical writers, I place ^b the whole article entire at the bottom of the page.

He speaks loosely ^c of its being then two hundred years from Christ to his own time. It is likely, therefore, that ^d it was not quite three hundred years since Christ when he wrote: nor are there any expressions throughout the work that should induce us to think he lived after the alteration of the state of things made by the conversion of Constantine. Cave therefore seems to have rightly concluded that he wrote about the year 270.

It is no improbable conjecture, that Commodian was a native of Africa: it is certain he ^e was originally a heathen: it appears from his acknowledgments in many places.

It may be argued that he was not an illiterate person; for, as

^a They who desire to know more of Commodian, and his time, and the editions of his work, will do well to consult Cav. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 136, &c. and Fabr. De Verit. Rel. Christ. p. 227, &c. I make use of Davies's edition at the end of Minucius Felix. Cantabr. 1712.

^b Commodianus, dum inter seculares litteras etiam nostras legit, occasionem accepit fidei. Factus itaque Christianus, et volens aliquid studiorum suorum muneris offerre Christo, suæ salutis auctori, scripsit mediocri sermone, quasi versu, librum adversum Paganos. Et quia parum nostrarum attigerat litterarum, magis illorum egstruere potuit dogmata, quam nostra armare. Unde et de divinis repromissionibus adversum illos vili satis et crasso, ut

ita dixerim, sensu differuit, illis stuporem et nobis desperationem incutiens, Tertulianum, et Lactantium, et Papiam auctores secutus. Moralem sane doctrinam, et maxime voluntariæ paupertatis amorem optime profecutus, studentibus inculcavit. Gennad. De V. I. cap. 15.

^c —Cur annis ducentis fuistis infantes? — Infr. vi. p. 202.

^d Vid. Davif. not.

^e Ego similiter erravi tempore multo, Fana prosequendo, parentibus insciis ipsis. Infr. i. p. 199.

Gens et ego fui perversa mente moratus. Infr. xxvi. p. 221.

Et ego qui moneo idem fui, nescius errans. Ib. xxxiii. p. 226.

—de cloaca levatus. —ib. lxiii. p. 253.

he himself says, he ^f was converted by reading the law; that is, as ^g Rigaltius understands him, the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. Gennadius plainly supposeth him to have been acquainted with secular authors before he read the sacred scriptures.

The only work of this author, mentioned by Gennadius, is still in being; consisting of eighty sections, or instructions, all acrostics, in a style between verse and prose.

Gennadius calls it a little book against the Pagans: but no one can suppose that to have been the title originally: it is more likely that ^h it was in general entitled instructions. Nor is it against heathens only; Christians likewise are here instructed and admonished as ⁱ Rigaltius clearly perceived.

In the former part of the work Commodian derides and exposes the heathen deities and their worship: this was an easy thing: herein, for certain, the Christians triumphed; and Commodian's thoughts are both just and acute. He likewise instructs the ^k Jews; and not content with this he also instructs Christians. This was yet a greater and more difficult attempt. To confute error by reason and argument is a laudable performance; but it may be soon done, and without much labour: to persuade men to act as Christians and friends of truth, requires more time and pains. Commodian aimed at this difficult work: and accordingly he instructs ^l catechumens, the ^m faithful, ⁿ Christian women, the ^o inferior clergy, ^p the pastors or bishops of the church, ^q and the aged; not to mention any other particulars.

Commodian ^r had no office in the church; but he endeavoured to be useful by propounding good instructions: and, if he was not a fine writer, he was an honest man and a zealous Christian.

II. Having given this history of Commodian, and his work, I shall make some extracts out of him, for shewing the sentiments of Christians at that time.

1. He often says that ^s the heathen people were deceived and imposed upon by their priests.

^f Abstuli me tandem inde, legendo de lege. Instr. i. p. 199.

^g Legem hic et alibi passim appellat libros utriusque Testamenti. Rigalt.

^h Ob ea perdoctus ignaros instruo verum. Instr. i. p. 199.

ⁱ Libello suo Commodianus titulum fecit Instructiones, scilicet ad paganos, ut ab idolorum cultu ad veram Christianae legis philosophiam convertantur: quin etiam ad Christianos ipsos, ne oblii Christianorum ad secularia redeant. Rigalt. in Praef. ap. Davif. p. 197. ^k Instr. xxxvii. xxxviii. xxxix. lx. ^l ib n. xlvii. ^m n. xlvii. xlviii. et passim. ⁿ n. lix. lx.

^o Mysterium Christi, zacones, exercite caste.

Idcirco ministri facite praecipia magistris. Instr. n. lxviii.

^p Pastor, si confessus fuerit, geminavit agonem, &c. n. lxix. ^q ibid.

^r Non sum ego doctor, sed lex docet ipsa claudendo. num. lxiii. p. 256.

^s Vos autem seducunt sacerdotes pauci. Instr. viii. p. 205.

2. Commodian believed that ^t men have free-will; that they are born reasonable beings, not brutes; and that, with the help of those means which God affords them, they are able to convert themselves from error and sin, if they will but use their natural powers, and exercise thought and consideration.

3. He shews what ^u was the common opinion of Christians at that time concerning the fall of the angels.

4. Commodian ^x heartily embraced the doctrine of the expected millennium. He deserves to be added to authors ^y formerly mentioned.

5. He mentions ^z the Lord's day: and, as ^a Rigaltius understands it, the passage shews that Christians had love-feasts upon that day.

6. What he says ^b of antichrist may deserve the notice of the curious.

III. Nothing remains but that we observe the scriptures cited by him.

1. Commodian quotes several books of the Old Testament; and in one place ^c Tobit.

2. He expressly speaks of the ^d Old Testament, which prophe-

Deludunt vos pauci scelerati vates inanes,

Extricare suam dum quærunt vitam.

Subornant aliis esse sub mysteria falsum,

Inde simulantes concuti numine quodam,

Majestatemque canunt, et se sub figura fatigant, &c. num. xvii. p. 212.

^e *Gens, homo, tu frater, noli pecus esse ferinum,*

Erue te tandem, et tecum ipse retracta.

Non utique pecus, nec bestia es, sed homo natus.

Tu te ipse doma sapiens, et intra sub arma. num. xxxiv. p. 227.

^f *Cum Deus Omnipotens exornaret mundi naturam,*

Visitari voluit terram ab angelis istam.

Tanta fuit forma feminarum, quæ flesteret illos,

Ut coinquinati non possent cælo redire. num. iii.

^g *Reddere decrevit nos ipsos in aureo sæclo. n. xxix. p. 224. Conf. n. xxxiv. p. 228.*

De cælo descendet civitas in anastasi prima.

Resurgemus illi qui fuimus illi devoti.

Recipiuntque bona, quoniam mala passi fuere.

Et generant ipsi per annos mille nubentes.

Comparantur ibi tota vestigalia terræ, &c. n. xlv. p. 237, 238. vid. et n. lxxx.

^h See p. 116.

ⁱ *De die Dominica quid dicis? Si non ante locavit,*

Excita de turba pauperem, quem ad prandium ducas. num. lxi. p. 254.

^k *Hic vero locus indicat, ævo Commodiani in ecclesia diebus Dominicis agapas in-*

esse fuisse. Rigalt. ^l Vid. num. xli.

^m *Prandia ab eo prospice Tobia, qui semper*

Omni diebus cum paupere iumpsit. num. lxi. p. 254.

ⁿ *Est Dei lex prima fundamentum posteræ legis.*

Non testamentum vetus de illo proclamatur. Instr. xxv. p. 220.

fied of Christ: therefore there was another which was called the New Testament: he likewise in the same place speaks of the old and new law.

3. He quotes or alludes to divers things ^e in the gospels.

4. He refers to the history of St. Stephen ^f in the Acts of the apostles.

5. He quotes divers of St. Paul's epistles; as ^g the first to the Corinthians, the ^h epistle to the Philippians, the ⁱ epistles to Timothy and Titus.

6. I cannot well tell whether ^k he refers to the epistle of St. James.

7. He plainly refers ^l to 1 John ii. 15.

8. He very frequently transcribes or refers to the ^m book of the Revelation, and once ⁿ expressly quotes it.

9. Commodian's respect for the scriptures appears many ways, in frequently adapting the words of it, and in the manner of quoting it.

10. He quotes ^o the writings of the blessed Paul as of authority: in one place, ^p Paul, or rather God by him, says. He refers ^q all men to the law, that is, the scriptures, in order to their understanding religion.

11. It is pleasing to observe this high respect for scripture running through the writings of all early Christians in general.

^e Idcirco cæcus cæcum in fossam deducit. num. xxvii. p. 220.

Unde Deus clamat, stulte hac nocte vocaris. n. lxiv. p. 256. Vid. Luc. xii. 20.

Vid. n. lv. p. 247, et alibi passim.

In talibus spes est vestra de Christo refecto. n. lxi. vid. Matth. xxv.

^f Rectam qui diligit Stephanus sibi vitam in iter. n. lxii. p. 254.

^g Crux autem stultitia facta est adulteræ genti. n. xxxvi. p. 229.

^h Vobis autem Deus est venter, et præmia jura.

Suggestit hoc Paulus apostolus, non ego duplex. n. xxxi. p. 225. vid. ad Philip. cap. iii.

ⁱ Apostolus autem tales jubet esse magistros.

Sit patiens rector, &c. n. lxix. p. 260.

^k Maledicti retine linguam, unde Dominum adoras. n. lxiii. p. 255. Vid. Jac. iii. 5.

^l Nolite diligere mundum, neque ambitum ejus. n. lvii. p. 249.

^m Vid. Instr. xli. xlii. xliii. lxxx. et passim.

ⁿ — ut ferunt operta Joannis. n. xliii. p. 237

^o Audi vocem, quæ vis Christiana manere, Beatus Paulus qualiter te ornari præcipit. n. lx. in.

^p Apostolus Paulus clamat, immo Deus per ipsum. n. lviii. p. 250.

^q Omnipotentis enim in lege quarite cuncti.

Lex docet, in medio ciet, consulite pro vobis. n. xxii. p. 217.

C H A P. L.

MALCHION.

I. *His history, and testimonies to him.* II. *Remarks, and his testimony to the scriptures.*

I. SAYS Jerom in his ^a Catalogue: ‘ Malchion, a most eloquent presbyter of the church of Antioch, who had taught rhetoric in the same city with great applause, held a disputation with Paul of Samosata, bishop of the church of Antioch, who had revived the opinion of Artemon: which disputation was taken down by short-hand writers, and is still extant. There is also another large epistle written by him in the name of the synod, and directed to Dionysius and Maximus, bishops of Rome and Alexandria. He flourished under Claudius and Aurelian.’

So Jerom in the above-mentioned work. Malchion ^b is again mentioned by him in his letter to Magnus among other ancient Christian authors.

Eusebius, in his account of the last council of Antioch, in the affair of Paul, speaks of Malchion after this manner in his ecclesiastical history: ‘ But ^c the person who especially convicted and confuted him, when he endeavoured to conceal himself, was Malchion, an eloquent man, and a sophist, president of the school of Greek literature at Antioch; who for his uncommon soundness in the faith of Christ had the honour to be made a presbyter in that church. Being the only person of all present that was able to detect that subtle and deceitful man, he entered into dispute with him: which disputation was taken down by short-hand writers, and we know it to be still extant.’

^a Malchion disertissimus Antiochenæ ecclesiæ presbyter, quippe qui in eadem urbe rhetoricam florentissime docuerat, adversum Paulum Samosatenum, qui Antiochenæ ecclesiæ episcopus dogma Artemonis intromiserat, excipientibus notariis disputavit, qui dialogus utique hodie extat. Sed et alia grandis epistola ex persona synodi, Romæ et Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ episcopis, dirigitur. Floruit sub Claudio et Aureliano. De V. I. cap. 71.

^b Necnon presbyterorum Pamphili, Pie-

rii, Luciani, Malchionis. ad Mag. Orat. ep. 83, [al. 84] p. 656, m.

^c μαλιστα δ' αὐτον ευθυμιας επικερτομενοι διηλεγξε Μαλχιων* αὐτο τα τε αλλα λογος, και σοφιστη των εντ' αὐτοχρειας ελληνικων παιδευστων διαλριος προεργας* η μην αλλα και δι επιρβαλλισται της εις χριτον πιστως ηπιστοιηια προσβιλεται της αυτου παροικιας ηξιωμενος. διος γδοι επιστημειμενων ταχυγραφον, ζηκσιν προς αυτον ιστησασματος, ην και εις ουνο φερεται ισμεν, μοις ισχυσε των αλλων κρυψιων ενια και απαληλον φωραται τον ανθρωπον. Euf. l. vii. c. 29.

Theodoret calls this person Malachion: he ^d says that he was formerly a sophist, afterwards ordained presbyter; that he disputed with Paul, and convicted him of holding the opinion he was charged with.

These are the principal remaining accounts of Malchion, and testimonies to him; for I think it scarce worth observing, what is said by so late a ^e writer as Trithemius, that Malchion taught rhetoric at Antioch with applause many years: and yet perhaps he concluded as much from an expression of ^f Theodoret. Indeed we do not find much notice taken of Malchion in ancient writers. The Greek Christians however have put him into their calendar for the service he did in opposing Paul of Samosata, as has been observed by Valesius ^g and others.

II. Having put down these testimonies to this author, I propose to mention some observations.

1. It is probable that Malchion was originally a heathen: Jerom does not expressly say so; but he says he taught rhetoric at Antioch with reputation; which is near the same with what ^h he says of Cyprian, who certainly was at first a heathen. Nor does Eusebius expressly say it: but that he taught Greek literature, as I have translated him; or ⁱ profane learning, as Du Pin renders the same phrase. And Theodoret, as well as Eusebius, says, that Malchion was at first a sophist. I presume these testimonies therefore may afford a probable argument that Malchion was originally a heathen; but whether they are sufficient to put the point beyond dispute I cannot say.

2. Malchion was an author, or a Christian writer. The Disputation or conference, mentioned by Eusebius and Jerom, must be reckoned his. It was, as we may well suppose, published by him, and not by Paul; and both Eusebius and Jerom speak of it as extant in their times: but it appears to me somewhat probable that Eusebius had never read it: he says we know it to be still extant: if he had seen it I suppose he would have expressed himself differently.

Jerom ascribes likewise to Malchion the epistle of the last council of Antioch, of which we have large fragments in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical history: indeed Cave ^k makes a doubt of

^d Μαλαχίωνος δὲ τινος προτέρου μὲν σοφιστεύσαντος, ὕστερον δὲ τῷ πατριάρχῳ τιμηθέντος χειροτονία, τὴν πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον ποιησάμενος διαλεξίν, ἐφωράθη τὸν χεῖρον ἀνθρώπον λέγων, κ. λ. Theod. Haret. Fab. L. ii. c. 8, p. 223, B. ^e — quippe qui rhetoricam in eadem civitate multis annis florentissime docuit. Trithem. de script. Eccl.

cap. 45.

^f — ὅστις δὲ πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν χειροτονᾷ. vid. not. ^d. ^g Vales. Annot. in Euf. l. vii. cap. 29. Vid. et Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. de Samosatensibus, art. 5, p. 268. ^h Vid. de V. I. cap. 67. ⁱ — les sciences profanes. Du Pin. Bibl. p. 193. ^k Cav. Hist. Lit. in Malchion.

this: he suspects that Jerom said it of his own head, without any good authority: but most other ¹ learned moderns, whom I have consulted, allow that epistle to have been composed by Malchion: I mean particularly Fabricius, Tillemont, and Fleury. Du Pin does not declare his opinion: he only observes that Jerom says Malchion was also the author of the letter written in the name of the synod against Paul of Samosata. I see no good reason to dispute Jerom's account; and the piece shews its author: Malchion was a sophist, and the epistle is a common place of accusation.

We have no certain account of any other works of Malchion, beside the disputation and epistle just mentioned. Jerom mentions these two only, without so much as hinting there were any other. Trithemius indeed says that ^m Malchion composed several excellent works of great use against heretics; but that is a mere flourish: he mentions none by name but the two we have taken notice of already.

3. There is nothing now remaining of Malchion that can be depended on as genuine, beside the fragments of the synodical epistle in Eusebius, of which I gave a large account ⁿ formerly. It has been observed by ^o several learned men, that Leontius of Byzantium, who lived near the end of the sixth century, has quoted two ^p passages of the Disputation or conference with Paul: but Du Pin says it ^q is not altogether certain that they are genuine. Tillemont ^r observes likewise, that there is a passage out of it in the letter of Peter the deacon to Fulgentius, and other African bishops: which Peter flourished in the same sixth century, but earlier than Leontius above-named: it is only a part of ^s what is cited by Leontius. I have not made any use of these fragments in my history of Paul ^t formerly given: nor do I intend now to take any thing out of them.

Trithemius expresseth himself as ^u if that Disputation was in being in his time: but ^v Fabricius well observes, in a note upon him, that those words mean no more than that it was extant in the time of Jerom, not of Trithemius. The same observation,

¹ Vid. Fabric. Bibl. Gr. l. vi. c. 4. Tom. xi. p. 346. Cette lettre fut composée par Malchion. Tillem. ut supra, p. 630. See likewise Fleury's Ecc. Hist. B. 8, ch. ix. p. 479. ^m Edidit nonnulla præclara opuscula, quæ suo tempore ad fidei Christianæ defensionem contra hæreticos multum conducere videbantur. Trithem. de Scr. Ec. cap. 45. ⁿ p. 80, &c. ^o Fabric. ut supra. Vales. ut supra. Tillem. ib. p. 630. ^p Vid. Baluz.

Concil. p. 19,—22. ^q Mais il n'est pas entièrement certain, qu'ils fussent véritables. Du Pin in Malchion, as above, p. 193. ^r Tillem. ubi supra, p. 629.

^s Vid. Baluz. Conc. p. 21. ^t p. 78, 79. ^u — De quibus exstat opus insigne dialogorum contra Paulum Samosatenum. Trithem. ut supra.

^v Extabat Hieronymi tempore, non Trithemii. Fabric.

I suppose, ought to be applied to ^x Bede in the eighth, and ^y Freculph in the ninth, century; who likewise speak of this piece as extant in their times: but they only transcribe Jerom: and it is he, in all these places, who is to be understood to say it was then extant; that is, in his time.

If the citations of Leontius and Peter the deacon are not to be relied upon, then we have not any certain notice of this work after Eusebius and Jerom: what has been the occasion of so great neglect of this piece I cannot say; but, methinks, it is pity it is not still extant.

4. I would observe, in the fourth place, that Malchion was the principal director of the last council of Antioch concerned about Paul of Samosata. In the first council moderate principles prevailed: in the last ^z council, when Firmilian was dead, and several other eminent bishops absented for some reason or other, very different measures were taken: these, as I formerly ^a intimated, may be chiefly ascribed to Malchion. We have now seen farther proof of that supposition: Eusebius assures us that Malchion only, and no other, was able to detect or confute Paul: and Jerom, besides, informs us that the large epistle written in the name of that council was composed by Malchion: what better evidence can be desired of this matter? Nor is this my thought only. Du Pin, speaking of Malchion, says: ‘he ^b had a famous dispute with Paul of Samosata in the second council of Antioch, held in 270; and, after having detected the errors which that heretic endeavoured to conceal, he ^c caused him to be condemned by the council.’

5. I observe, in the fifth place, what was Malchion’s opinion concerning the doctrine of the trinity does not clearly appear. Eusebius speaks of Malchion as a man of uncommon soundness in the faith of Christ: but if Eusebius was an Arian, as some think, and if that character relates to the doctrine of the trinity, this testimony, instead of assuring us of Malchion’s orthodoxy upon that head, may rather occasion a suspicion that he Arianised. There is another thing, which may occasion a doubt whether Malchion held the Nicene faith. The council of Nice established the homousian, or consubstantial doctrine: but it is said that the council of Antioch (in which, as has been shewn, Malchion directed and governed) rejected the word consubstantial as improper. This has been taken notice of by several ancient

^x Vid. Bed. Chr. p. 22, Cantabr. 1722. ^y Freculph. Chr. T. iii. l. iii. c. 11. ap. Bib. Patr. Tom. xiv. p. 1166, D. ^z See p. 80, 85. ^a p. 85. ^b Du Pin, *ib.* before, p. 193. ^c — il le fit condamner par le Concile, *ib.*

writers
and ^f B
of orth
is no
not sta
me at
ters ab
who h
apparen
ments
word,
6. V
nothing
ments
taken o
tioch,
only to
owned
ceived
concern
some, c

AN

I. Anat
His
Laod

I. S
of La

THESE
p. 1024
p. 759, B
Male
sus est: 10
runt? Od
fel trece
runt, &c.
Conf. Fac
1074, 11 17
1024, 7
50 [4. 3

writers of the fourth century; ^d Athanasius, ^e Hilary of Poitiers, and ^f Basil. This therefore, if the council of Nice be the standard of orthodoxy, casts a suspicion upon that of Antioch; and ^g there is no small difficulty in reconciling these councils: but I may not stay to inquire exactly into that matter: it is sufficient for me at present to give these hints, and refer to those ancient writers above-named, and some ^h learned moderns of great note, who have endeavoured to reconcile this contradiction, real or apparent; and to shew that, notwithstanding the different sentiments and conduct of these two councils with regard to this word, yet they both held the same doctrine.

6. With regard to Malchion's canon of scripture: as we have nothing of him remaining besides the above-mentioned fragments in Eusebius, and I have formerly ⁱ observed the notice taken of scripture in the synodical epistle of the council of Antioch, I have nothing farther to add here upon this head, but only to say, That it ought to be taken for granted that Malchion owned and respected those scriptures which were generally received at that time among Christians: but what was his opinion concerning the books of the New Testament, then doubted of by some, cannot be certainly known.

C H A P. LI.

ANATOLIUS, and three others, bishops of Laodicea.

- I. *Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, his history and works.* II. *His testimony to the scriptures.* III. *Eusebius, likewise bishop of Laodicea.* IV. *Stephen,* V. *Theodotus, bishops of the same city.*

I. SAYS Jerom: 'Anatolius, ^a a native of Alexandria, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, flourished under the emperors Probus

^d Διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐλαβήθη τὸ πρῶτον σφισμα τῇ σαμοσατέως, ἐρηκασί, καὶ ἰσχυρῶς χρίσεν ἐκκομισίον. Ath. de Synod. p. 759, B.

^e Male homouision Samosatenus confessus est: sed numquid melius Arian negaverunt? Octoginta episcopi olim respuerunt; sed trecenti et decem octo nuper receperunt, &c. Hil. de Syn. n. lxxxvi, p. 1200, Cont. Facund. l. x. c. 6.

^f Καὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν σαμοσατέων συνελθόντες, ἐκκαλεῖται τὴν λαοὶν ὡς καὶ εὐσεβίου. Basil. Ep. 52. [A. 300] p. 145, B.

^g De hac

synodorum ἀντιλογία laborarunt theologi, qua veteres, qua neoterici. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 29, a. m.

^h Petav. de Trin. l. iv. c. 5. num. ii. iii. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 1. num. ix. x. xi. Bafnag. Ann. 1269, num. vi. Tillem. ut sup. Paul. de Samol. art. 5, p. 631, 632.

ⁱ See p. 87. ^a Anatolius Alexandrinus, Laodiceæ Syriæ episcopus, sub Probo et Caro imperatoribus floruit. Miræ doctrinæ vir fuit in arithmetica, geometria, astronomia, grammatica, rhetorica, dialectica, Cujus ingenii magnitudinem

' and

‘and Carus. He was exceedingly well skilled in arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, grammar, rhetoric, logic. The greatness of his capacity may be perceived from his work concerning Eas-
ter, and from his ten books of institutions of (A) arithmetic.’

Probus reigned from 276 to August 282; Carus the remainder of that year, and all 283. Nevertheless, Cave has placed Anatolius as flourishing about the year 270, and not much amiss; Eusebius, whom he succeeded, having died, as is ^b supposed, in 269 or 270; though some ^c think not before 272.

Anatolius is placed in Jerom’s Chronicle at the third year of Probus, the year of Christ 278, after this manner: ‘Anatolius, ^d bishop of Laodicea, well acquainted with all the principles of the philosophers, is now much celebrated.’

Nor did Jerom forget Anatolius ^e in his letter to Magnus.

Jerom undoubtedly was indebted to Eusebius for what he knew of this person. Now therefore we will see what Eusebius himself writes of him in his Ecclesiastical history.

He says ‘that ^f Anatolius was an Alexandrian, and bishop of Laodicea after Eusebius; and that for eloquence, and for skill in philosophy and the Greek literature, he was the most eminent person of his time; being a complete master of arithmetic, geometry, and likewise of logic, natural philosophy, and rhetoric: for the sake of which qualifications, as is said, he was desired by the people of Alexandria to set up a school for the Aristotelian philosophy.’

When that request was made we cannot say exactly; but, if ever, undoubtedly before he left Alexandria, and was advanced to the episcopal office. Nor is there any certain information given us of his complying with that request: though Fabricius in ^g one place scruples not to say, without hesitation, that he set up such a school at Alexandria.

Anatolius and his friend Eusebius performed signal services for the people of Alexandria, both Christians and others; when

de volumine, quod super Pascha composuit, et decem libris de arithmetice institutionibus, intelligere possumus. Hier. de V. I. c. 73. (A) They who desire to see what learned moderns say of Anatolius may consult Cav. H. Lit. T. i. Tillem.

Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 637, — 643. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. ii. p. 274, &c. T. v. p. 277. ^b See Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 641. Bishag. Ann. 269, n. ix.

^c Pagi. Ann. 269, n. ix. ^d Anatolius Laodiceus episcopus philosophorum discipulis eruditus plurimo sermone celebratur. Chr. p. 377. ^e Ep. 83, [al. 84].

^f Γενος μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀλεξανδρεὺς λόγον δ’ ἐνεκα, καὶ παιδείας τῆς ἑλληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας τε, τὰ πρῶτα τῶν μαθητῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐκ μνηστῶν ἀπενεγκάμενος, αὐτὸς ἀριθμητικῇ, ἡλιακῇ, καὶ ἀστρονομικῇ, καὶ τῇ ἑλληνικῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν, λόγον ἔχει πρὸς τῶν τῆδε πόλεως συνησθῆναι αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦσθαι. Euf. H. E. l. vii. c. 32, v. 284, D. 285, A. ^g Anatolius Alexandrie scholam Aristotelicam constituit, factus deinde episcopus in Syria Laodiceus circa A. Chr. 270. Bib. Gr. T. ii. p. 274.

Bruchium,

Bruchium, or Pyrchium, one of the quarters of that city, in which too was the citadel, suffered under the extremities of a siege. Anatolius was shut up in Bruchium; Eusebius was without among the Romans, the besiegers. One of those services is particularly related by ^h our ecclesiastical historian, to whom I refer. Anatolius had the better opportunity to be useful to the public by means of the high esteem he was in: for Eusebius says, that ⁱ with universal consent he had preeminence above all the magistrates or senators of Alexandria, that were in Bruchium.

Learned men ^k find no small difficulty in settling the time of this siege. Tillemont thought it ^l to be in the reign of Gallienus in 263 or 264; Bafnage ^m in 262 or 263; whose opinions seem to me more probable than their's who place it later.

Soon after that siege was over Anatolius ⁿ left Alexandria.

Our historian tells us ' that ^o Theotecnus, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, ordained Anatolius bishop, intending that he should succeed him: and it is certain that for a short time they both presided together in that church: but Anatolius, ^p going to Antioch to be present at the council called upon the occasion of Paul of Samosata, as he was passing through Laodicea, was detained there by the brethren, Eusebius being dead.'

It is reasonable to think that our historian must mean the last synod in the affair of Paul, which was held in 269. After this he says nothing farther of Anatolius. But here he died; for, as the historian adds, he ^q was succeeded by Stephen, the last bishop of Laodicea, before the persecution of Diocletian began.

' Anatolius,' says ^r Eusebius, ' did not write many books; however, from those which have come down to us may be perceived both his eloquence and his extensive knowledge and learning, particularly from his work concerning Easter.'—The ^s same Anatolius left also the Principles of arithmetic in ten books, and likewise some other works, monuments of his

^h L. vii. c. 32, p. 285 et 286, A.

ⁱ Μερίας μὲν ἐν τῇδε καὶ ἀλλὰς ἀριστίας ἐν τῇδε ἀλφειαν τῇ πυρρυχίᾳ πολιορκία ὑπομένοντι· αὐτὸν τὸν ἐν τῇδε προνομίας ἐλάττει πρὸς ἀπαντῶν κείμενον· ib. p. 285, A. ^k Vid. Pagi in Baron. Ann. 269, n. ix. x. xi.

^l See his Hist. des Emp. m Gallien, art. 12. T. iii. P. iii. p. 974, 975, et p. 1175. ^m Bafn. Ann. 262, n. iii. ⁿ Euf. ib. p. 286, B.

^o Τῷ τῷ αὐτοῦ—δυστυχῶς χείρας ἐκ ἐπισκοπῆς ἐπιστολῆς. ib. p. 282, A. ^p Euf. ib. A. B.

^q Καὶ τῷ ἀνατολίῳ δὲ τὸν βίον μεταλλά-

ξαίος, τῆς ἐκείσε παροιμίας ὑσάλος τὸν πρὸ διαγμὴν καθίσταται στεφανός. ib. p. 282, B.

^r ἢ μὲν ἐν ἰσπαδάσῃ στήλῃ τῷ ἀνατολίῳ συγγραμμάτων· τούτων δ' ἐκ ἡμῶν ἡλλήνων, δι' ὧν αὐτὸν καταμαθεῖν δύνατον ὀμνέτω, τὴν λογικὴν καὶ πολυμαθίαν· ἐν αἷς μάλα τα πνευματικὰ διδάγματα παρρησιῶν. ib. p. 286, B. C.

^s Καὶ ἀριθμικὰς δὲ καταλείπειν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν οἷς δέκα συγγραμμάτων ἐισαγωγὰς, καὶ ἄλλα διηγήματα τῆς περὶ τὰ διὰ σχολῆς τε αὐτὴ καὶ πολυπραγίας. ib. p. 287, D. 288, A.

'diligence in studying the divine scriptures, and of his understanding therein.'

Eusebius has inserted in his Ecclesiastical history ^a a long passage of Anatolius's book upon Easter, or his Paschal canons, as he there calls it: and Ægidius Bucherius has published the same work in an ancient Latin version said to be Rufinus's; which is generally allowed to be, for the main at least, the genuine work of Anatolius. It is thought by some, that there are remaining fragments of his other work, the Institutions of arithmetic. Fabricius ^u has published some fragments in Greek, which he supposed to be of Anatolius.

There were others of this name, which ought to be distinguished from our Anatolius. Fabricius ^x has mentioned several. Cave ^y also well argues, that our Anatolius is different from him whom ^z Eunapius speaks of as master of Jamblichus: though ^a Valesius confounded them; and ^b Basnage is pleased to signify his approbation of Valesius's opinion.

Anatolius, in the passage ^c cited by Eusebius from his Paschal canons, mentions several Jewish writers; Philo, Josephus, Musæus, and others more ancient; two of the name Agathobulus, called rabbins, or masters; and Aristobulus, one of the seventy translators of the Old Testament, or part of it. He likewise ^d mentions some book of Enoch: and in that part of his work, which we have in Latin only, very honourable mention is made of ^e Origen.

II. As there remains but a small part of the work of Anatolius, except what is the Latin translation, a brief account of his testimony to the scriptures will suffice.

1. He quotes ^f as from the gospel ^f these words: Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him; *Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?* Matth. xxvi. 17. And see Mark xiv. 12, Luke xxii. 7.

2. He quotes also those ^g words of the Lord; *My soul is ex-*

^a εκ των περι της παρχας ανατολιου καιωνων. x. l. p. 286, C. D. et p. 287.

^u Bib. Gr. l. iii. c. xi. T. ii. p. 275—278. ^x Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 277, Vid. et T. ii. p. 275. ^y Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 136.

^z Eunap. Vit. Jambl. init. ^a Ann. in Euseb. p. 158. ^b Ann. 269, n. ix.

^c Euseb. p. 287. ^d Παρεστητικα και τα εν τω ενυχ. καθημερι. ib. p. 287, D.

^e Sed et Origenes omnium doctissimus, et calculi componendi perspicacissimus (quippe qui et χαλκωτης vocatus,) libel-

lum de Paschate luculentissime edidit. Anatol. ap. Bucher. p. 439.

^f Contra evangelii dictum, dicentis: Prima autem die azymorum accesserunt discipuli ad Jesum. Quin dubium non est, quin xiv. dies sit in quo discipuli Dominum interrogaverunt, secundum morem antiquitus sibi constitutum: Ubi vis paremus tibi comedere Pascha? p. 443, sub. fin.

^g Aliud enim est secundum quod ab apostolo, imo a Domino præceptum est, cum contristato contristari [Rom. xii. 15] et

'ceeding sorrowful, even unto death.' Matth. xxvi. 38. And in the same manner, and in the same place, the words of Luke xv. 6.

3. He^h expressly mentions John the evangelist, the same that leaned on the Lord's breast.

4. He quotesⁱ very respectfully the direction of the apostle in Rom. xii. 15, intimating that it ought to be attended to as spoken by the Lord himself.

5. In the passage of the Paschal canons, preserved by Eusebius, there is a manifest reference to the latter part of the third chapter of St. Paul's second epistle to the Corinthians: 'But,' says^k he, 'all these proofs are not necessary for those from whom the veil of the law of Moses is taken off; who may with open face always behold as in a glass Christ, and the things of Christ, both his doctrine and his sufferings:' see 2 Cor. iii. 14—18; and in the Latin translation of this work we find the words of^l 2 Cor. vi. 14.

6. He speaks^m with respect of the Old as well as the New Testament.

7. He says of some, thatⁿ they can by no means prove their point by the authority of the divine scripture.

8. Though this be little, here is sufficient to shew that this learned Alexandrian concurred with other Christians in a high respect for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament: and it is likely that his canon was much the same with that of Origen.

III. It may be proper to take notice here of Eusebius, not only because he was predecessor of Anatolius in the see of Laodicea, but also because he was of Alexandria, and they were intimate friends whilst they lived in their native city.

Though Eusebius was not an author, and therefore is wanting in Jerom's Catalogue, and in many other histories of ecclesiastical

cum cruce passio compati, ipso dicente: Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem: aliud cum victore inimicum antiquum triumphante, ac summo triumpho devicto adversario letante collatari, ipsomet præcipiente: congratulamini mihi, quia inveni ovem quam perdideram. Anatol. ib. p. 445.

^h Quorum exemplum sequentes utique hodie omnes Asiæ episcopi (quippe qui et ipse ab auctore irreprehensibili, Joanne scilicet evangelista, et pectoris Domini incubatore, doctrinarum sine dubio spiritualium potatore;) regulam susceperunt. ib. p. 44.

ⁱ See before, note 8.
^k Παρηγοῖ δὲ τὰς τοιαύτας τῶν ἀποδείξεων ὅτι; ἀπαιτῶν, ὡς περιηγήται μετὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ

μυστικῶς νομῶν καλυμμένα· ἀνακαλυμμένην δὲ τῷ προσώπῳ λοιποῦν ἤδη χρίσιν καὶ ταῖς χρίσεσσι καλοῦντ' ἐξισθαι, μνηματὰ τε καὶ παθηματὰ. Euf. ib. p. 287, D.

^l Quia solemnitas Dominicæ resurrectionis lux est. Et non est communicatio luci cum tenebris. Anat. ap. Bucher. p. 443.

^m Quod in veteri quidem testamento non potest probabiliter inveniri, Domino per Moysen præcipiente: Septem diebus commedetis azyma, &c. ib. p. 443.

ⁿ Nam qui ac ætate lunæ Pascha definiunt posse celebrari, non solummodo illud auctoritate divinæ scripturæ affirmare non possunt, sed et—animarum periculum incurrunt. ibid.

writers,

writers, he was a man of no small consideration, and is mentioned as ^o an eminent person in Eusebius's or Jerom's Chronicle.

It is likely my readers may remember that this Eusebius has been already mentioned with honour in this work, in our history of Dionysius of Alexandria. Eusebius was then a deacon in that church. The words of Dionysius, speaking of the state of affairs there in the persecutions of Decius and Valerian, and which were ^p formerly cited, are these: 'the deacons that survive after those that have died of the plague are Faustus, Eusebius, Chæremon: Eusebius, I say, whom God qualified from the beginning [referring here, it is likely, to his conduct in the Decian persecution], and furnished with great resolution and ability for fulfilling the office of ministering to the confessors in prison, and for burying the bodies of the perfect and blessed martyrs, not without the utmost peril.'

Our historian, having finished his quotation of that letter of Dionysius, adds: 'It ^q ought to be observed that Eusebius, whom Dionysius calls deacon, was afterwards bishop of the church of Laodicea in Syria.'

Eusebius, still deacon, accompanied Dionysius when he made his confession before Emilian the præfect of Egypt in 257, as ^r formerly shewn.

His settlement in Laodicea is related by his namesake, the ecclesiastical historian, in this manner: 'Socrates ^s was succeeded in the care of the church of Laodicea by Eusebius, a native of the city of Alexandria. The occasion of his removal was the affair of Paul. Passing through Syria upon that account, he was seized by those who were concerned for the interest of religion in those parts, who would by no means let him return home. He was succeeded by Anatolius; one good man coming after another, as the saying is.'

It may be well supposed that the time of Eusebius's going into Syria was the year 264, or thereabout, when the first council was held at Antioch upon the case of Paul of Samosata: then Eusebius entered upon this see, and was succeeded by Anatolius about the year 270.

IV. 'After ^t the death of Anatolius,' as we are informed by our historian, 'Stephen was advanced to the presidentship of that church, and was the last bishop there before the persecu-

^o Eusebius Laodicens insignis habetur. Chron. p. 177, init.

^p p. 65, & Euf. H. E. l. vii. c. xi. p. 261, B.

^q See b. fore, p. 65, & Euf. 261,

C.

^r See p. 61. H. E. l. vii. c. 32, p. 284, D.

p. 283, A. B.

^s Euf.

^t Euf. ib.

^u tion:

tion: he was admired by many for his eloquence, and philosophy, and Greek learning. However, when the persecution broke out he did not behave like a philosopher; but shewed himself rather to be a dissembler, and mean spirited. What was his fault is not certainly known: we may be disposed to think that he apostatized, and renounced the Christian religion; though Eusebius does not expressly say it: thereby, as I apprehend, shewing both his sincerity as an historian, and his tenderness for the reputation of a brother, and a fellow-creature, overcome by temptation.

V. Eusebius proceeds: 'Nevertheless' that church did not fall to ruin: it was restored to it's wonted splendour by Theodotus, who was designed bishop of that church by God himself, the Saviour of all men. He by his actions shewed himself to be what his name signified [a man given of God], and a true bishop. He was an excellent physician for the body; but for the cure of souls he had not his equal: such were his humanity, his integrity, his compassion for the afflicted, and his diligence in relieving those who needed his assistance: with which was joined uncommon skill in the divine scriptures, or the things of religion.'

To this person Eusebius inscribed his Evangelical preparation; there styling him 'beloved of God, and an ornament to the episcopal office.'

What Eusebius says of his being an excellent physician for the body has induced Fabricius to put Theodotus into his Catalogue of ancient physicians.

This bishop of Laodicea, so much commended by our Eusebius, is reputed an Arian by several learned moderns, to whom I shall refer in the margin; as ^a Vigerus, editor of Eusebius's Preparation, ^b Pagi, and ^c Tillemont.

And there is more than a little ground for that supposition; for Arius in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia ^d names Theodotus among others his favourers: Theodoret ^e intimates that the same persons defended the Arian doctrine at the council of Nice. In another place ^f he mentions Theodotus among those who had imbibed the Arian principle, and were it's principal

^a ib. p. 288. B. C.

^x πολὺ δὲ τῶν αἰώνων τὸ πλεονέκτημα τῶν μαθημάτων συνιστάται. ib. p. 288. C.

^y — τινὲς αὐτοῦ ἐπισκοπῶν χρημα, διετέλεσαν οὐδὲν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκείνῳ, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐπιφάνισα.

Præp. Ev. cap. 1. init.

^z Vid. Bib.

Gr. T. xiii. p. 433.

^a Hunc ego non alium arbitror, quam Laodiceum episcopum, qui — Stephano in episcopatu suc-

cessit, Arianæ impietatis fautorem acerrimum. Viger. in Præf. ad fin.

^b Ann. 318, n. xvii. et xviii.

^c See his history of the Arians, art. 4, and note 2, and elsewhere. Mem. T. vi.

^d ap. Thdrt. l. i. cap. 5, p. 21. A. et Epiph. H. 69, n. vi.

^e Thdrt. l. i. c. 7, p. 26. A.

^f Id. l. 5. c. 7.

patrons :

patrons: he likewise says that ^s he came to Antioch with Eusebius of Nicomedia in 331, to depose Eustathius. Athanasius ^h affirms that Theodotus, and others whom he names, had written, the like things with Arius before the council of Nice: not to insist upon the letter of Constantine ⁱ in Gelasius Cyzicenus, written to him after the council of Nice.

When Theodotus entered upon the episcopate is not certainly known: Vigerus, in the preface before cited, says he succeeded Stephen about the third year of Constantine, or the year of Christ 308; which is not altogether improbable, it being evident from Eusebius that Stephen was bishop before the persecution, and for some time after it began: but the exact time of Stephen's death or removal, and of the accession of Theodotus, I think cannot be determined. However, Pagi ^k well observes that Theodotus died before the council of Jerusalem in 336, because Sozomen mentions George, then bishop of Laodicea, as present at it.

Theodotus is wanting in Cave and Du Pin, not being generally reckoned an author: but perhaps he might be justly so esteemed, considering what is said of him by Athanasius. It is true, Athanasius does not quote Theodotus as he does some others; but the reason was, that ^l the letters were not at hand, as he says; which he mentions by way of excuse for sending no more out of them: for which cause he omitted to cite several, whom by name he charges with having written the like things with Arius.

This chapter began with Anatolius, whose history was the principal design of it: however, we have been led to take notice of several others mentioned by Eusebius; and I presume it may not be unacceptable to any, as it serves to represent the state of Christianity at that time.

^s l. i. c. 21, p. 52. B. ^h Προ δε D. ⁱ ap. Labb. Conc. T. ii. p. 283.
 τε γινώσκειν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς συνόδου, ἐγράψαν ^k Ann. 318, n. xviii. ^l Καὶ τὰς με-
 και οἱ περὶ Εὐσεβίου, — καὶ Θεοδοῖον, κ. λ. ἐπιστολάς αὐτῶν ἢ ἐσχόντες ἐποίησαν, ὥστε τὰς
 Ath. de Synodis, n. xvii. T. i. p. 730. ἀποστείλαι. Athan. ib. p. 731. D.

C H A P. LII.

THEOGNOSTUS.

I. *His history.* II. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament.*

I. THEOGNOSTUS, ^a an ancient writer, no where mentioned by Eusebius or Jerom, flourished, as ^b Cave thinks, about the year 282; and, though we have not now any certain proofs of his exact age, that computation cannot be very erroneous; as may appear from what we shall observe presently.

Theognostus is mentioned by Athanasius, Philip Sidetes, Stephen Gobar, and Photius.

Athanasius has spoken of him in two of his works: in the first he quotes him against the Arians, to shew ^b that the fathers of the Nicene council did not first begin to use the expression, 'Of the substance,' it having been before used in the same subject by Theognostus; whom Athanasius here calls ^c a learned or an eloquent man. In the other ^d work Athanasius mentions Theognostus together with Origen: he gives Theognostus the character of an admirable man, and worthy of esteem: he speaks of them both in an honourable manner, and as ancient men. In that same work he afterwards alleges a passage from Theognostus, which I intend to make use of by and by.

Stephen Gobar ^e says that Athanasius had often mentioned Origen and Theognostus in an honourable manner: whether he means only these two places, or whether there were still some more in which Theognostus was mentioned by Athanasius, we cannot say positively.

In the Fragment of Philip Sidetes, published by Mr. Dodwell, it is said that Theognostus was president of the Christian or catechetical school at Alexandria. The order of those presidents,

^a Concerning this writer may be seen Cav. Hist. Lit. Du Pin. Bib. des Aut. Ecc. Tom. i. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 10, §. vii. Dodwell. Diff. Iren. in Append. p. 511. Fabric. Bib. Gr. lib. v. cap. 1, p. 276. Tillemont, Origene, art. 37. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. 3, p. 269, 270, and some other authors to be hereafter mentioned in this chapter.

^b Vid.

Cav. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 146, 147. Oxon.

^c μάλα τόνον, ὡς χριστιανιστὴς Ἀρισταίος, οὗτος

Θεογνώστου, αἰσθη λογισμῶν, καὶ παρὲν τὸ τοῦ τῆς οὐσίας ἵππων. Ath. de Decret. Nic. Syn. p. 230. B.

^d Παλαιὸς μὲν ἦν ἄνθρωπος, Πριγκιπὸς ὁ πολυμαθὴς καὶ φιλοσοφῶν, καὶ Θεογνώστου ὁ δαυμαστὴς καὶ σπουδαῖος. Id. Ep. 4. ad Serap. p. 702. C.

^e ib. p. 703. B. C. D. ^e Οὗτος Πριγκιπὸς καὶ Θεογνώστου ὁ, τὴν μέγαν Ἀθανασίον ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐν πολλοῖς ἀπεδύχθη λόγοις. ap. Phot. Cod. 232, p. 904.

according to that writer, is this: Origen^f was the fourth; after Origen, Heraclas; after him Dionysius; after him Pierius; after Pierius, Theognostus. What regard ought to be had to Philip, I^s cannot certainly say; but as we are not able to disprove what he writes, so I think likewise that it is not safe to depend entirely upon him.

From Photius we learn that^h Theognostus published a work called Hypotuposes, or Institutions, in seven books or discourses. The title of the work in Photius's copy was this: 'The Institutions of the blessed Theognostus, an Alexandrian, and Exegetes;' which last word I find rendered by some learned men commentator and interpreter of the sacred books: but that meaning appears to me at least doubtful; nor can I assign any other with which I am fully satisfied. Mr. Dodwell, in his notesⁱ upon the forecited passage of Philip, says that the title of the work was borrowed from Clement, and that the title given the author denotes his public office of teaching in the school at Alexandria.

Photius says, 'that^k in the first book Theognostus discourseth of the Father, and endeavours to prove him creator, even against those who supposed matter coeternal with God.' One may be apt to think that this part of our author's work was very curious and philosophical. Afterwards Photius expresseth his dislike of the doctrine of the first six books of the Institutions in several respects, saying that the author^l speaks of the Son as a creature; that he too closely followed Origen in some of his peculiarities, which may be found in his books of Principles; and that with him he supposeth angels and dæmons to have certain fine bodies. With the seventh or last book Photius appears well enough satisfied. He gives an agreeable character of this writer's style: it is, he says, full and expressive, and yet has nothing redundant: he has the Attic purity and elegance without affectation; and in the greatest plainness and perspicuity there is nothing mean and vulgar.

If we had had Photius's extract entire, we should not have been at a loss about the exact age of Theognostus; for he put

^f τεταρτος προση της χριστιανικης διακρισης
Πριγκιπς. Μετα Πριγκιπς — μετα Πιεριον
Θεογνωστου. Fragn. Ph. Sid. ap. Dodw.
Diff. Iren. p. 488.

^g See before,

^h Ανεγνωσθησαν Θεογνωστη αλεξανδριου λο-
γοι επτα· η η επιγραφη, τα μακαριου Θεογ-
νωστη αλεξανδριου και εξηγητη υποτυπωσεις.
Phot. Cod. ev. 280. in.

ⁱ Ipsum
titulum a Clemente sumptum

decessore constat. Et quidem locum illum
scholæ catechetice magistralem denotat,
decendique munus publicum vox illa ex-
γητης. Dodwell. ut supr. p. 512.

^k ΕΝ ΜΕΝ ΗΝ ΤΩ ΠΡΩΤΩ ΛΟΓΩ ΔΙΑΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙ
ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗ ΠΑΤΕΡΟΣ, ΚΑΙ ΟΤΙ ΕΣΤΙ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΟΥΣ ΕΠΙ-
ΧΕΙΡΩΝ ΔΕΙΚΝΥΤΑΙ, ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΥΠΟΔΙΔΑΚΤΩΝ
ΣΥΝΑΙΔΙΟΝ ΕΛΛΗΝ ΤΩ ΘΕΩ. Phot. ib. p. 280. in.

^l ἡνὸν δὲ λέγων, κτισματὸς αὐτοῦ ἀποφάναι. ib.

down the time when he flourished: but the last words of the extract are wanting.

We may however conclude, from what we have seen, that Theognostus was an Alexandrian, and that he flourished some time after Origen, before the end of the third century.

Eusebius's silence about this writer has occasioned divers surmises and speculations. Baronius ^m cannot help thinking it happened, not without a malicious and fraudulent design, to bury in oblivion the name and writings of a strenuous assertor of the consubstantial doctrine: Huet ⁿ is almost of the same mind, and suspects that these Institutions had been interpolated by the Arians in the space of time between Athanasius and Photius: but ^o Tillemont is not convinced by their reasonings. Indeed, he who carefully compares Athanasius and Photius will perceive that they both read exactly one and the same work; and that the Institutions were as uncorrupted in the time of the latter, as of the former. Athanasius found in them somewhat to his purpose; but there were other things he did not like. He ^p says that, in what he alleges out of the second book of the Institutions, Theognostus speaks his own sentiments; but there were other things proposed only in the way of argument and disputation. In like manner, ^q Photius is not positive that the things he condemns were the real sentiments of the author of the Institutions; at least he is aware of this apology for him: but he disallows it, and says such things ought not to be published to the world in writing at any rate. Mr. Dodwell ^r ascribes Eusebius's silence to nothing but negligence, and supposeth him less accurate in matters near his own time than elsewhere. Certainly Eusebius did not know every thing; nor had he a fair opportunity, or sufficient leisure,

^m Et, ut omittamus de aliis dicere, nonne dolo malo Theognosti theologorum celeberrimi nomen atque scripta silentio obvolata reliquit, quod consubstantialis nominis esset assertor? At is non præterit Athanasium. Baron. Ann. 109. lix.

ⁿ Sane studiosissimum virum, et disertum, et admirandum eum appellat Athanasius: atque idcirco prætermittam ab Eusebio mentionem illius probabile est, quod ab Arianis partibus fuerit alienus. Quapropter corruptas ejus Hypotyposes ab hujus sectæ patronis, quemadmodum et Clementis librum eodem titulo inscriptum, non immerito Andreas Schottus conjectat. Huet. Origen. lib. i. sect. i. num. 3.

^o Néanmoins S. Athanasé marque assez, que des son temps il y avoit des choses différentes dans cet auteur sur la divinité de Je-

sus-Christ. Mais il dit, que ce n'estoit que comme pour discuter la vérité, et qu'il exprimoit ensuite son vray sentiment. Tillem. ib. 269.

^p Ο μὲν γὰρ Θεογνῆτος τα προτερα ὡς ἐν γυμνασίᾳ ἐξέτασας, ὑπερὸν τῆν αὐτὰ δοξᾶν τίθει, οὕτως εἰρηκεν. Ath. de Decret. Nic. Syn. p. 230. C.

^q εἴτε (ὡς αὖ τις εἴποι) ἐκβιάσμενος τῶν ὑπερ αὐτὰ ἀπολογίαν, ἐν γυμνασίᾳ λόγῳ καὶ ἐ δόξης ταῦτα περὶ τίθει· — ἐγγράφῃ δὲ λόγῳ καὶ κοινῇ προκείσθαι μέλλοντος νόμῳ τοῖς πασι, εἰ τις τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ βλασφημίας τὴν προσηρμένην εἰς ἀδωκίαν ἐπιφέρει ἀπολογίαν, εἰς ἀσθεὶ κατὰ κράτος συνήγοριαν. Phot. ib. p. 280.

^r — quanquam ejus nullus meminit Eusebius, in rebus sui temporis minus profecto, quam in reliquis, accuratus. Dodw. ib. p. 512.

'pardon may be obtained: for * those who have tasted of the heavenly gift, (Hebr. vi. 4.) and have been made perfect, there remains no excuse, or any means of escape.'

From that expression, *tasting the heavenly gift*, I would infer, that our author received the epistle to the Hebrews. This may be further argued from what precedes in Athanasius: for, proceeding to the testimonies of Origen and Theognostus concerning the subject he was upon, he thus expresseth himself: 'They' both write of this matter, saying that this is the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; when they who have been favoured with the gift of the Holy Ghost in baptism return to sin: therefore, say they, such receive no remission, according to what Paul also says in the epistle to the Hebrews: *For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they fall away, to renew them again unto repentance: ch. vi. 4, 5, 6.*

This they both * say.' Then he alleges their passages in order, And this recompence then we have of the labour of our inquiry into the life and writings of Theognostus; that we have found * another learned Alexandrian, of the third century, who received the epistle to the Hebrews.

C H A P. LIII.

THEONAS, bishop of Alexandria.

- I. His history. II. An epistle ascribed to him. III. His testimony to the books of the New Testament.

I. THEONAS, as ^a Jerom says in his Chronicle, was the fifteenth bishop of Alexandria. He held that see, as we are informed by ^b Eusebius, nineteen years; who in the same place speaks of Pierius and Achillas, as flourishing among the presbyters in that episcopate, and observes the succession of the bishops of Alexandria about that time: after Dionysius was Maximus; then

* ^a ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις τῆς ἡρακλῆ [al. ἡρακλῆ] δαρείας καὶ πελειαθῆσιν, κ. λ. ^b ibid. ^c ib. p. 702. C. D. ^d ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς λέγομεν, καὶ ἰδὼν δὲ ἀναγὰρ πρὸς τὸν δαριαν. ^e ib. E. ^f See before of Origen, Vol. 2, ch. xxxviii, num. x, and

in this vol. Dionysius of Alexandria, p. 101, 102.

^a Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ quintusdecimus episcopus præfuit Theonas ann. xix. Hieron. Chr. p. 177. f. ^b H. E. l. 7. c. 32, p. 289, C. D.

Theonas, about the year of Christ 282, who was succeeded by Peter, of whom we shall write hereafter.

II. There is extant a ^c letter from Theonas to Lucian, chief chamberlain to the emperor, which emperor ^d was not a Christian. But learned men are not fully satisfied who this Theonas is: the editor makes a scruple of ^e ascribing it to the bishop of Alexandria; though he thinks it ought to be received as a genuine monument of antiquity, composed in the beginning of the fourth century: and indeed, according to the tenor of the epistle itself, Christianity was not yet fully established; though ^f it had made great progress in the world, even under persecutions.

Cave allows that ^g Theonas, author of this letter, was a bishop; but whether of Alexandria, or some other place, he cannot determine: the letter he thinks ^h to have been written about the year 305; but he delivers this opinion as conjectural only upon a point that cannot be clearly decided.

Tillemont is much disposed to think ⁱ it a genuine epistle of Theonas, bishop of Alexandria, written ^k about the year 290. Lucian he supposeth to have been chief chamberlain to the emperor Dioclesian, and a faithful servant of Jesus Christ.

I am inclined to assent to Tillemont concerning the author of the epistle and the time of writing it.

The letter was undoubtedly written in Greek; we have only a translation in but indifferent Latin.

III. As the several learned critics above quoted admit the antiquity of this piece, I shall observe the author's testimony to the scriptures.

The author often delivers his Christian counsels to Lucian, and by him to other Christians in the imperial palace, in words of the New Testament, or in expressions allusive to them: but without quoting any particular books, which might not be judged proper in an epistle.

^c Theonas episcopus Luciano Præposito Cubiculariorum invictissimi principis nostri. Theon. ap. Luc. Acher. Spic. T. xii. p. 545. Sed quia, ut sentio, diversis officiis etis adscripti, et omnium tu, Luciane, præpositus dicis. Id. ib. p. 547.

^d Nam quanto magis princeps ipse nondum Christianæ religioni adscriptus. — ib. p. 546. ^e Vid. Praef. p. 21, 22.

^f Gratias ago Omnipotenti Deo, et Domino nostro Jesu Christo, qui fidem suam per universum orbem in salutis nostræ unicū remedium manifestare, ac etiam in tyrannorum persecutionibus ampliare non desistit. &c. Theon. ib. p. 545.

^g Theonas — dignitate episcopus: cuiusnam vero loci, haud facile est divinare. H. L. T. i. p. 172.

^h Ætatem si quæras, circa annum 305; claruisse arbitror, nempe sub Constantio Chloro, qui Cæsar creatus est anno 292. — Augustus renunciatus est ann. 305; obiit — an. 306. Cav. ib.

ⁱ La lettre de l'évêque Theonas à Lucien — est selon toutes les apparences un fruit de la piété de notre saint. Lucien étoit le chef des chambellans de l'empereur Diocletien, et un fidele serviteur de J. Ch. Tillem. Saint Theonas. M. E. T. iv. P. 3, p. 1218.

^k Id. ib. p. 1223.

He ^l mentions the gospel and apostle, as the divine oracles of Christians.

He ^m recommends the daily reading of the sacred scriptures, and meditating upon them, as the best means of improving the mind in every virtue, and as the most useful helps for enabling Lucian, and the other Christians with him, to discharge their several offices with reputation, as became the followers of Jesus Christ.

C H A P. LIV.

PIERIUS, presbyter of Alexandria.

^a PIERIUS, says ^a Jerom in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers, presbyter of the church of Alexandria, taught the people with great reputation in the time of the emperors Carus and Dioclesian, when Theonas was bishop of that church: such was the elegance of his discourses and treatises, which are still extant, that he was called the younger Origen. It is certain that he was a great ascetic, and an admirer of voluntary poverty, and that he was well skilled in logic and rhetoric, and that after the persecution he spent the rest of his days at Rome. There is a very prolix homily of his upon the prophet Hosea, which was pronounced on Easter-eve, as the discourse itself shews. That is St. Jerom's summary account of this writer.

Carus reigned in 282 and 283. Dioclesian reigned from 284 to 305. And, as Eusebius ^b informs us, Maximus, immediate

^l Interdum et divinas scripturas laudare conabitur, quas mira diligentia et largissimo impendio Ptolomæus Philadelphus in linguam nostram traduci curavit: laudabitur et interim evangelium, apostolusque, pro divinis oraculis. Theon. ib. 548.

^m Non prætereat dies, quin opportuno tempore dato aliquid sacrarum lectionum legatis, aliquid contemplantini, nec sacræ scripturæ literaturam abjiciatis. Nihil adeo animam pascit, et mentem impinguat, sicut sacræ faciunt lectiones. Sed ex illis hunc maxime capite fructum, ut patientia vestra iuste et pie, hoc est, in charitate Christi, vestra officia exequamini, et transitoria omnia ob ejus promissiones æternas contemnatis. ib. p. 550. ^a Pierius, Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ presbyter, sub Caro

et Diocletiano principibus, eo tempore quæ ecclesiæ Theonas episcopus regebat, florentissime docuit populos, et in tantam sermonis diversorumque tractatum, qui usque hodie existant, venit elegantiam, ut Origenes junior vocaretur. Constat hunc miræ *ασκησιως*, et appetitorem voluntariæ paupertatis, scientissimumque dialecticæ et rhetoricæ artis, et post persecutionem omne vitæ suæ tempus Romæ fuisse versatum. Huius est longissimus tractatus de propheta Osée, quem in vigilia Paschæ habitum, ipse sermo demonstrat. Hieron De V. I. cap. 76.

^b Καὶ ἐπ' ἀλεξανδρείας δὲ μαζιμοὶ οὐλοῦντα ἔλεσι μετὰ τὴν διόκλητον τελευτῶν ἐπισκοπεύσαντα, θεωρῶντας διὰ διδασκαλίας καὶ οὐ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπὶ ταύτοις τῶν πνεύματι πρεσβυτέρων ἡγούμενων ἀρχιδιάκων ἐπὶ τῶν

‘ successor of Dionysius, governed the church of Alexandria eighteen years, and was then succeeded by Theonas: under him Achilles, made presbyter at the same time with Pierius, was famous. He was intrusted with the care of the catechetical school, and was an excellent example of a truly philosophical and Christian conversation. Theonas, having borne the episcopal office nineteen years, was succeeded by Peter, who obtained great honour during his episcopate, which he held twelve years. He governed the church three years before the persecution: the rest of his time he passed in a more strict and mortified course of life, but still without neglecting the common good of the churches; for which reason, in the ninth year of the persecution, he was honoured with the crown of martyrdom, being beheaded.’ So writes Eusebius.

Maximus therefore, having succeeded Dionysius in 264 or 265, was himself succeeded by Theonas in 282; he by Peter in 300, who died a martyr in the year 311 or 312, as is computed. Achilles, just mentioned by Eusebius as catechist, was bishop of Alexandria after Peter; but for a short time only, as it seems: indeed, since Achilles was ordained presbyter about the same time with Pierius, and had the care of the school under Theonas, it may be argued that he must have been somewhat advanced in years in 311, when he came to be bishop: he was succeeded by Alexander in 312 or 313. I have here put down these several successions at Alexandria; I believe it will not be disagreeable to my readers.

Farther, Eusebius, speaking of the most eminent men of his own time, or near it, says, ‘ One of these was Pierius, presbyter at Alexandria, celebrated for his strict course of life and philosophical learning: he was likewise admired for his diligence in the study of the scriptures, and his expositions of them, and his public discourses to the people.’

In Jerom’s letter to Magnus, Pierius is placed among other learned Christian writers next after Pamphilus.

In another place he mentions Pierius’s interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 7; and reckons him among several others, who, as he says,

ζῆλο, τῆς ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὰ διδασκαλικοὶ ἐν χειρισμῷ. Euseb. H. E. l. vii. c. 32, p. 289, 290.

180. Socrat. l. i. cap. 5.

μετ’ ὁλίγου χρόνου προση, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπέχει πρὸς αὐτὴν. μετὰ δὲ τούτων ἀλεξάνδρος, κ. λ. Theodoret. H. E. l. i. c. 2.

1 Euseb. ib. p. 289. A.

1 Origenes,

Dionysius, Pierius, Eusebius, Caesariensis, Didymus, Apollinaris, latissime hanc epistolam interpretati sunt: quorum Pierius, quum sensum apostoli ventilaret atque edulceret, et proposuisset illud exponere, Volo autem omnes esse sicut meipsum, adjecit: ταῦτα λέγων παῖλος αὐτῆς ἀγαπῶν κηρύσσων. Hieron. Ep. 31, [al. 52], p. 243.

had

had largely explained that epistle. Cave^s understands Jerom to mean some commentary; but I do not think it necessary to take him in that sense: several of the writers there mentioned may have largely explained that text in their homilies, or letters, or treatises, without making a commentary upon the epistle.

In his prologue to his Commentary upon Hosea, ^h Jerom again mentions the long discourse of our author upon that prophet, which he spoke of in his Catalogue: he calls it an extemporary and eloquent discourse.

It has been observed by several learned men ⁱ of late times that there were copies of the bible, or however of some parts of it, called Pierius's, which were in great esteem: that observation is founded upon a passage of St. Jerom in his commentary upon Matt. xxiv. 36. *But of that day and hour knoweth no man, nor not the angels in heaven, but my Father only.* Jerom says, 'that ^k in some Latin copies of his time was added, *nor the Son*; whereas in the Greek copies, particularly the copies of Origen and Pierius, that clause was wanting.'

These things concerning Pierius I have collected from Eusebius and Jerom, authors of the best credit. Philip Sidetes ^l says, 'that Pierius was catechist at Alexandria after Dionysius: the next after him,' he says, 'was Theognostus, then Serapion, then the great Peter, who suffered martyrdom.' And Photius informs us that ^m in his time it was said that Pierius was president of the school of that city: accordingly it is now generally taken for granted, by learned men, that he had some while that charge; but I think without good foundation, since it is no where mentioned by Eusebius or Jerom: and why they should omit this, when they so particularly mention his fame for popular discourses, I cannot tell. Eusebius mentions Pierius and Achillas together: he expressly says of this last that he was catechist: why did he not say the like of Pierius, if true? Philip says that Pierius was catechist after Dionysius. When did he succeed his predecessor in that chair—when he was made bishop, or after his death?

^s Scripsisse commentarios in primam ad Corinthios epistolam autor est Hieronymus. Cav. H. L. in Pierio. ^h Pierii quoque legit tractatum longissimum, quem in exordio huius prophetæ die vigiliarum Dominiæ passionis extemporaliter et disertis sermonibus profudit. Hieron. Pr. in Osee. p. 1135. ⁱ Origenis ejusdem, Adamantii et Pierii, doctoris Alexandrini, exemplaria quoque Novi Testamenti in magno pretio habebantur, tanquam omnium purissima. Eorum mentionem reperio apud Hierony-

mum ad Matth. xxiv. Hody de Bibl. Text. l. iv. c. 2, p. 622. Conf. Mill. ad Matth. loc. et in Prolegam. n. dccxxvii.

^k In quibusdam Latinis codicibus additum est, neque filius: quum in Græcis, et maxime Adamantii et Pierii exemplaribus hoc non habeatur adscriptum. Sed quia in nonnullis legitur, differendum videtur. Hieron. in Matth. p. 118.

^l *Ἰστοῦ τῶτον Περῖος. ἡστὰ Περῖος Θεογνώστου κ. λ.* Philip. Sid. ^m Vid. Phot. Cod. 118, 119.

Dionysius was chosen bishop in 247, or 248, and died in the year 264 or 265. At which of those seasons did Pierius take upon him the catechetical office? Is either of them consistent with what Jerom says of Pierius, that he flourished under Carus and Dioclesian, and survived the persecution? Tillemont^a is much of my mind: and Cave, though at the beginning of his article of Pierius he roundly calls him master of the school at Alexandria, afterwards proposes divers difficulties affecting Philip's account.

Photius says that Pierius was a martyr; and that a brother of his, named Isidore, suffered at the same time: but the silence of Eusebius must needs render this doubtful: and Jerom is positive that Pierius outlived the persecution under Dioclesian, as before seen: nor does Tillemont receive this account.

But though we have no good reason to think that Pierius was a martyr, he appears to have been in great esteem. Epiphanius^o speaks of a church at Alexandria called by his name: and Photius^p intimates that there were temples and churches built by the faithful in honour of him and his brother.

There is still somewhat farther to be taken from Photius, who read a work of^q Pierius in twelve books or discourses: Photius does not mention any other title. His character of it is this: 'His style is clear and perspicuous, easy and familiar, like that of extemporary discourse. He expresseth himself after the manner of the ancients, very differently from what now obtains in the church. Of the Father and the Son he speaks rightly enough, except that he makes two substances and two natures: nevertheless, as appears from what precedes and follows the place I refer to, by substance and nature he may mean only subsistence, and not in the sense of the Arians. But of the Spirit he speaks dangerously and impiously, for he makes him inferior in glory to the Father and the Son.—And, with Origen, he seems to hold the preexistence of souls.'

Photius here also mentions Pierius's writing upon Hosea and Easter, and therein treating of the Cherubim and Jacob's stone pillar; and something written by him^r upon St. Luke; which words of Photius are not very clear: but it seems as if the title of one of the twelve books abovementioned was to this purpose: Upon Luke, or Observations upon Luke's gospel.

^a Mem. Ecc. T. iv. Saint Theonas. p. 583. Ed. de Paris. T. iv. P. 3. p. 1225.
^o Har. 69, c. 2, p. 728. C.

^p ος ως φασι, και νως και
 εις τον κατα λυκαν, κ. λ. ib. p. 300. m.

^q Λοις δα τε εις
 περιεχει δωδεκα. Cod. 119, p. 300.

^r Εχει δε χρησιμ εις τον λογον, η η επισημη
 φη, εις τον κατα λυκαν, κ. λ. ib. p. 300. m.

This is what we know of Pierius: from which it is easy to conclude, that in his time he adorned the Christian profession by his piety, learning, and public labours. As we have none of his works, we cannot particularly judge of his sentiments: but from the testimonies which we have collected it appears that a great part of his time and labour was employed in studying and interpreting the scriptures; and it may be supposed that his canon was the same as that of Origen, or very little different.

Pierius is placed by Cave at the year 283: some may be apt to think he should have been put lower; but it is likely that learned writer supposed Pierius was made presbyter in the beginning of the episcopate of Theonas. Moreover, Jerom spoke of Pierius as flourishing in the reign of Carus.

CHAP. LV.

I. *Dorotheus, presbyter of Antioch.* II. *Dorotheus, author of the Synopsis of the life of the prophets, and of the apostles and disciples of Christ.*

I. SAYS Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical history, ‘About this time Timæus succeeded Domnus in the episcopate of the church of Antioch, whom Cyril succeeded within our memory. In ^a his time was Dorotheus, presbyter of the church of Antioch, a learned man whom we knew. He was very studious in the sacred scriptures, and acquainted himself so far with Hebrew, as to be able to read the ancient scriptures in their own language with understanding: he was a man of a liberal mind, [or was extremely well educated, or perhaps was a man of high birth,] and was not unskilled in Greek literature: but he was an eunuch from his birth: this being an extraordinary thing, the emperor took notice of him, and made him overseer of the purple dye-house at Tyre. We ^b have heard this person expound the scriptures indifferently well. Cyril was succeeded in the episcopate of Antioch by Tyrannus.’

^a Καθ' οὗ δωροθέου πρεσβυτέρου τῆ κατὰ ἀντιόχειαν κείμενου τῆς κατὰ λόγιον ἀνδρα γνημῆς φιλοκαλῶς δ' οὗτος περὶ τὰ θεία γέγραπται, καὶ τῆς ἑβραίων ἐπεμεληθὴ γλωττίης, ὡς καὶ αὐτῆς ταῖς ἑβραϊαῖς γραφαῖς ἐπιστημονίαις

ἐλυγχανεῖν. καὶ δ' αὖτος τῶν μαλίστα εὐθερίων, προπαιδείας τε τῆς καθ' ἑλληνικὰς καὶ αἰμαίρος, κ. λ. Euf. l. vii. cap. 32, in. p. 284, B.C.

^b Τὴν μάλιστα τὰς γραφὰς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διηγεμένην κατήκουσάμην. ib. C.

I have transcribed this passage after this manner with the connection, that we might the better perceive the time of Dorotheus. Cyril ^e is supposed to have been bishop of Antioch from about the year 280, to the year 300, or longer. We may therefore reckon that Dorotheus flourished about 290, and afterwards. Who is the emperor meant by Eusebius is not certainly known; but it seems to me not improbable to be Dioclesian, in the early part of his reign.

It ought to be supposed that Dorotheus first served in civil offices, and after that became presbyter in the church of Antioch.

This Dorotheus ^d ought to be distinguished from one of the same name, elsewhere mentioned by ^e Eusebius, who was one of the eunuchs of Dioclesian's palace, and suffered martyrdom; and from another Dorotheus, author of the Synopsis, or short history of Christ's apostles and seventy disciples. Fabricius ^f indeed supposeth, that this presbyter of Antioch, and the martyr of the same name, were one and the same person, and that there is not sufficient reason to distinguish them: but I think he is almost singular in that opinion.

Dorotheus, presbyter of Antioch, not being a writer, is not in Jerom's Catalogue: and for the same reason there is no distinct article allotted him in Cave, or other modern authors of ecclesiastical libraries, or such like works: nevertheless I have thought it proper to insert his history here distinctly, though it be short, as a proof that there were men of learning and quality among Christians in those early ages; and that Christianity did not discourage any branch of useful knowledge: though, as we have here and often elsewhere occasion to observe, the scriptures were their principal study.

II. I take this opportunity to give an account of the supposed author of 'The Synopsis of the life and death of the prophets, and also of the apostles and disciples of Jesus Christ.'

It has been thought by some that ^g he was bishop or presbyter of Tyre at the beginning of the fourth century, in the year 303, about which time he underwent many sufferings in the per-

^e See Tillem. in St. Lucien d' Antioche. Mem. T. v. P. iii. p. 149, et note (4) p. 406, et Pagi Ann. 283, n. viii. Basnag. Ann. 283, n. ix. ^d Vid. Cav. in Dorotheo Tyr. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 163, et Pagi Ann. 283, n. viii. Basn. Ann. 283, n. ix. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. v. P. ii. p. 9, et note (8) p. 342. ^e H. E. l. viii. c. 1. p. 292, A. et cap. vi. ^f Bib. Gr. T.

vi. p. 145, in notis. ^g Dorotheus, Tyr. riorum urbis, ut volunt, episcopus. Presbyterum quidem cum martyrologio Romano faciunt recentiores. Quod non aliunde profluxisse videtur, quam quod hunc cum Dorotheo Antiocheno male confuderunt. Cav. H. L. [ad ann. 303] T. i. p. 163, a.

secution begun by Dioclesian, and afterwards died a martyr under Julian in the year 363, when he was 107 years of age.

Cave^b has divers just observations upon this piece and it's author: he thinks the Synopsis to be the work of an anonymous author in the sixth century. Frederic Spanheim computed the author to have lived in the same age. Cave was of opinion, that they who called this Dorotheus presbyter, instead of bishop of Tyre, confounded him with Dorotheus presbyter of Antioch. And may I not rather say, (if I too may propose a conjecture) that possibly this Dorotheus is a mere fictitious person, called bishop of the church of Tyre for no other reason but because Dorotheus, of whom we spoke before, is said by Eusebius^k to have been overseer of the purple dye-house at Tyre?

Tillemont argues, that^l there could be no bishop of Tyre at the beginning of the fourth century named Dorotheus: if there had he would have been mentioned by Eusebius or Jerom.

Fabricius^m may be consulted for the editions of this work.

As for the work itself, though it has been too often quoted, it is now generally allowed by learned men to be fabulous, and of little or no value. For preventing such quotations of it for time to come, and that my readers may be the better satisfied about it's real character, I shall place divers censures upon it in the margin. One is thatⁿ of the author of the Collection of the Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima, which I make use of; another is taken^o out of Bellarmine's book of Ecclesiastical writers; and the third from^p the Annals of Baronius.

^b 1. Ex hoc fragmento perspicere licet, hunc Dorothei, ut præ se fert, exscriptorem, scripsisse Probo et Philoxeno Coll. hoc est, anno Christi 525.—2. Admodum probabile est, hunc anonymum fuisse ipsius Synopsi Dorotheanæ conditorem. Cav. ib. p. 170.

^l Quod vero habet Epiphanius, Har. li. quæ est Alogorum, et ex eo Pseudo-Dorotheus in Synopsi de lxx. discipulis, seculi minimum vi. scriptor, hinc Nicephorus, et alii, fuisse Marcum unum ex iis qui a Christo adlecti fuerunt, magis dubium, imo falsum. Spanh. De Hist. Evang. Scriptor. cap. 12, Opp. T. ii. p. 275.

^k —και τιμωσαι η επισημη της κατα τυρον αλαργης βαφης. Euf. H. E. p. 284, C.

^l Mais il est encore plus difficile de s'imaginer, que s'il y avoit été en ce temps là un Dorothee tel que le peint Theophane, Eusebe n'en eust rien écrit, ni S. Jerome mesme, qui le doit reverer comme un pere l'eglise, et comme un martyr, &c. Tillem. Not. 8, sur S. Dorothee. ib. p. 342.

^m Bib.

Gr. T. vi. p. 145, 146.

ⁿ Dorotheus

—Exstat hic sub ejus nomine Synopsis, —sed plane fabulosa, nulliusque apud eruditos auctoritatis. Vid. Ind. Alphabet. in Bib. P. P. Max.

^o At hujus Dorothei nullam mentionem inveni apud Eusebium, S. Hieron. vel Gennadium, aut etiam Joan. Trithemium, qui scripserunt de viris illustribus. Ipsa vero Synopsis plena est fabulis. Consulat lector quæ iste auctor scribit in vita Isaie, Hieremæ, Elisei.—Præterea consulat quæ scribit in vita Jacobi Alphæi, et Clementis, et in summa sciat, ab isto numerari inter 72, discipulos Christi omnes, qui ab apostolo Paulo numerantur, etiam si ethnici fuerint vel feminæ; et illos omnes non solum discipulos Domini, sed etiam episcopos facere. Non meminissim libri tam fabulosi, nisi vidissem a multis citari, et non minimum fieri. Ex Bellarmino de Scrip. Ecc. ap. Bib. P. P. Max. T. iii. p. 421, H.

^p Nomina autem discipulorum, qui a Domino fuerunt electi, dum singula ex-

This

This Synopsis might be compared with some like books ascribed to Hippolytus, of which ^a I spoke formerly, and ^r with some articles in Ephiphanius, and with the last chapter of the second book of the Apostolical constitutions, and Cotelierius's notes upon it.

I shall take notice of but very few things in this Synopsis.

Among Christ's seventy disciples the first here named is James, the brother of the Lord: of whom he says, that ^s he was stoned by the Jews, and was buried in the temple at Jerusalem, near the altar.

Here likewise are absurdly numbered among Christ's seventy disciples the seven deacons, and others, mentioned in the Acts, and Clement, and Timothy, and Titus, and almost all others, mentioned by name in St. Paul's epistles.

CHAP. LVI.

VICTORINUS, bishop of Pettaw.

I. *His history.* **II.** *Others of the same name.* **III.** *His works, and extracts out of a poem against the Marcionites, ascribed to him.* **IV.** *Testimonies to him.* **V.** *His opinions.* **VI.** *His testimony to the scriptures of the Old and New Testament.*

I. VICTORINUS, bishop of Pettaw, or Petaw upon the Drave in Germany, flourished according to ^a Cave about the year 290; according to ^b Sixtus Senensis about the year 270. He had the honour to die a martyr for Christ under the persecution of Dioclesian; and, as is ^c supposed, in the year 303.

St. Jerom's account of him in his book of *Illustrious men* is to this purpose: 'Victorinus, ^d bishop of Pettaw, understood Greek ^e better than Latin: hence his works are excellent for the sense,

primere conati sunt, omnes fere, quorum invenerunt in epistolis Pauli fieri mentionem,—inter discipulos Domini adnumerarunt.—Primus post Hippolytum (quod invenerimus,) ejus rei auctor fuit Dorotheus, qui falso cognomine Tyri episcopus inscribitur,—Hic inquam Dorotheus Cæsarem quendam unum fuisse dicit ex discipulis Domini, &c. Baron. Ann. 33, n. 40.

^a Vol. ii. chap. 35.

^r Vid. Epiph. H. 20, n. iv. et H. 51, n.

vi. p. 428.

^s Jacobus frater Domini secundum carnem, qui et Justus vocatur, et primus Hierosolymorum episcopus constitutus est. Lapidibus ibi a Judæis abruptus occubuit, atque in templo prope altare sepultus est. ap. B. P. P. ib. p. 427, G.

^a Cav. H. L. T. i. ^b Sixt. Sen. Bib. S. lib. iv. p. 308.

^c Cav. ib. Vid. d. Pagi Ann. 303, ix. Basnag. 303, n. xvi.

^d Victorinus, Petavionensis episcopus, non aequè Latine ut Græce novit. Unde

'but

but mean as to the style. They are such as these: Commentaries upon Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Habacuc, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and the Revelation of John, Against all heresies, and many other works. At last he was crowned with martyrdom.

Cave^e thinks that Victorinus was a Greek by birth, or else born in the confines of Greece. I suppose that learned man concludes this from what Jerom says concerning Victorinus's style in this and some other places, which will be taken notice of hereafter. Cave likewise supposeth that Victorinus professed rhetoric, or oratory, before he was a bishop. And so ^f Cassiodorus says more than once.

Tillemont thinks it probable that ^g Cassiodorus confounded our Victorinus with Victorinus of Africa (of whom we shall speak presently), because what Jerom says of our bishop's style does not agree to one who had been a professor of rhetoric: but I think that cannot be easily admitted: for Cassiodorus appears ^h to have known both these authors, and speaks of them distinctly. It is not likely therefore that he should confound their characters. And, notwithstanding what Jerom says, Victorinus might be a man of good learning, and able to write elegantly in Greek, as he himself seems to allow. Victorinus's disadvantage, therefore, probably was this: that whilst he was well skilled in Greek he wrote chiefly in the Latin tongue, which was in use in the country where he lived, though he was not completely master of the propriety and elegance of that language. I might add, that the style of Victorinus the African is not admired, though he gained so much reputation in his professorship.

opera ejus grandia sensibus, viliora videntur compositione verborum. Sunt autem hæc: Commentarii in Genesim, in Exodum, in Leviticum, in Isaiam, in Ezechiel, in Abacuc, in Ecclesiasten, in Cantica Canticorum, in Apocalypsin Johannis, adversum omnes hæreses, et multa alia. Ad extremum martyrio coronatus est. De V. I. cap. 74.

^e ——— si non origine Græcus, in Græciæ saltem confinio natus videtur, ex oratore episcopus, ut non uno loco nos docet Cassiodorus. Cav. ib.

^f De quo libro [Ecclesiastæ] et Victorinus de oratore episcopus nonnulla disseruit. Cassiod. Inst. Div. Lit. c. 5, T. ii. p. 512. De quo [Matthæo] et Victorinus de oratore episcopus nonnulla disseruit. Ib. c. 7. p. 513.

^g See Saint Victorin de Pettau, in Tillem. Mem. T. v. P. ii. p. 215. ^h What Cassiodorus writes of our Victorinus may be seen before at note ^f,

or hereafter at ^e ^g ^h under numb. iii. He likewise mentions Victorinus the rhetorician several times. Quorum Commentaria Mario Victorino composita, in Bibliotheca mea vobis reliquisse cognoscor. Cass. de Rhetorica. T. ii. p. 535, b. in. Præterea secundum Victorinum Enthymematis altera est definitio. Ib. p. 536, m. Modum autem hypotheticorum syllogismorum si quis plenius nosse desiderat, legat librum Marii Victorini, qui inscribitur de syllogismis hypotheticis. Id. de Dialectica, p. 539, Conf. ejusdem Chron. T. i. p. 365, infr. m.

ⁱ Stilus Victorino parum felix, præsertim in dogmaticis perplexus et ingratus, et qui vix ulla adeo decantatæ eloquentiæ vestigia retinet. Cav. H. L. in Fab. M. Victorino. — Scripsit adversus Arium libros more dialectico valde obscuros. Hieron. De V. I. cap. 101.

We must content ourselves with this short history of our Victorinus, unless some more particulars should offer themselves to us when we come to observe his works, and the testimonies given to him.

II. But it is fit that we first take notice of some other ancient writers of this name.

Our Victorinus had been long supposed bishop of Poitiers in France, until John Launoy ^k in the last century published his Dissertation concerning him: and he was so fortunate as to prove his point, and satisfy the learned in general, that Victorinus, bishop and martyr, of whom Jerom speaks in the forecited chapter of his Catalogue, and often elsewhere, ought not to be numbered among Gallican bishops, but was bishop of Petabion, or Petabium in upper Pannonia: or, according to the modern division of that country of Pettaw, in the dukedom of Stiria, and circle of Austria.

At the end of that Dissertation, Launoy added an appendix concerning five illustrious persons of this name; that is, four beside our bishop.

The first of which is Victorinus, who ^l wrote in defence of Praxeas, and is mentioned by Tertullian.

The second is our Victorinus, bishop and martyr.

The third is Victorinus, an African, who, after he had long taught rhetoric at Rome with great applause, embraced the Christian religion: he is mentioned by ^m Augustine, ⁿ Jerom, and ^o Cassiodorus. According to ^p Cave, he flourished about the year 362, and died in 370, or soon after.

The fourth is ^q Victorinus of Marseilles, likewise professor of rhetoric. He flourished ^r about 434.

The fifth is Victorinus Lampadius, of Antioch, who published a piece entitled Consular and imperial orations, mentioned by ^s Photius.

There is another author sometimes ^t called Victorinus; but it is now ^u generally thought that his name is more properly Victorius, of Aquitain. He flourished about ^x 457.

^k Joann. Launoyi Constantiensis, Paris. Theologi, de Victorino Episc. et Mart. Dissertatio. Ed. Secund. Paris. 1664.

^l Sed post hos omnes etiam Praxeas quidam hæresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit. Tertull. de Pr. Hær. cap. 53, p. 255, A. ^m Confess. l. viii. cap. 2. ⁿ Victorinus, natione Afer, Romæ sub Constantio principe rhetoricam docuit, et in extrema senectute, Christi

se tradens fidei scripsit, — Hier. de V. I. cap. 101, Vid. ejusd. Procm. in Ep. ad Gal. Vid. et adv. Ruf. l. i. T. iv. p. 367, in. ^o See before, note ^h, p. 287. ^p H. L. ^q Victorinus rhetor Massiliensis, &c. Gennad. de V. I. cap. 60, Conf. Sidon. Ep. l. v. ep. 21. ^r Cav. ubi supra. ^s Cod. ci. p. 276. ^t Vid. Gennad. de V. I. cap. 88. ^u Vid. Laun. ut supra, p. 44 et 45. ^x Cav. ib.

Beside these, it is supposed that there were many others of the same name, who bore a glorious testimony to Christ in times of persecution: but it is by no means necessary that I should give any particular account of them at present.

III. We saw just now, in Jerom, a catalogue of this writer's works. Trithemius ^y makes no additions: he only names the same pieces in a little different order. We must now take some farther notice of them.

1. The first work of our author, mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, is a Commentary upon Genesis. In ^z another place Jerom quotes Victorinus, as having commented upon the history of Isaac's blessing of Jacob, which is recorded in Genesis, ch. xxvii. The Fragment, concerning the creation of the world, published ^a by Cave from the library of the archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth, may be a part of this Commentary.

2. Of the Commentaries upon Exodus, Leviticus, Ezekiel, Habacuc, the Canticles, we have nothing remaining: nor is there any farther notice taken of them, except in such catalogues of his works as have been already mentioned.

3. The Commentary upon Isaiah is again mentioned by Jerom ^b in the preface to his own exposition of that book: he speaks there of Victorinus as the only Latin who had written upon that prophet; or, at least, who had explained any large part of him, whilst several Greek writers had bestowed a great deal of labour that way. In ^c another place he mentions a mystical explication, which Victorinus gives of a passage in Isaiah, ch. vi. 2.

4. In his Commentary upon the book of Ecclesiastes, Jerom observes Victorinus's ^d explication of Ecc. iv. 13, in which he

^y Vid. Trithem. cap. 46. ^z Quoniam autem polliciti sumus, et de eo quid significaret in figura adungere, Hippolyti martyris verba ponamus, a quo et Victorinus noster non plurimum discrepat: Non quod omnia plenius executus sit, sed quod possit occasionem præbere lectori ad intelligentiam latiore. Hieron. ad Dam. Ql. 3, p. 569, in. T. ii. Bened. al. Ep. 125. ^a Exitat quidem penes me Victorini tractatus—de Fabrica Mundi.—Videtur esse hic libellus *αποκαλυπτικος* quoddam ex Commentariis vel in Genesin, vel in Apocalypsin decerptum; quod proinde tum propter venerandam antiquitatem, tum propter celeberrimi martyris namam, hic subjungam. Cav. Hist.

Lit. in Victorin. T. i. p. 147, 148.

^b Magnique laboris et operis est, omnem Isaie librum velle edisere, in quo majorum nostrorum ingenia sudaverunt, Græcorum dico. Cæterum apud Latinos grande silentium est, præter sanctæ memoriæ martyrem Victorinum, qui cum apostolo dicere poterat: Etsi imperitus sermone, non tamen scientia. Hier. Pr. in Il. p. 3. ^c Sex alæ uni, et sex alæ alteri. Victorinus noster duodecim apostolos interpretatus est. Hieron. ad Dam. T. iii. p. 518, Bened. al. Ep. 142.

^d Origenes et Victorinus non multum inter se diversa senserunt. Post generalem illam sententiam, quæ omnibus patet: quod melior sit adolescentulus pauper et

agreed with Origen. I have put part of Jerom's passage in the margin, as of some use, to shew our author's manner in his Commentaries: and I would likewise refer my readers to what there follows. This Commentary upon Ecclesiastes is expressly mentioned by ^e Cassiodorus: it seems by him that Victorinus had explained some parts or passages only of this book.

5. In his Catalogue, Jerom says nothing of Victorinus's having written upon St. Matthew: but, in the preface to his own Commentary upon that evangelist, he mentions ^f Victorinus with other Latin commentators. Cassiodorus too mentions ^g Victorinus's explication of that gospel. The expressions used both by Jerom and Cassiodorus seem to imply, that Victorinus's performance was no large work; but contained either short notes upon the whole, or else explications of some passages only.

6. The Commentary upon the Revelation is also mentioned by Cassiodorus as well as Jerom. Says Cassiodorus: 'Victorinus, ^h the bishop, already mentioned by us more than once, explained briefly the most difficult places in this book.'

There is still extant ⁱ a Commentary upon the Revelation, which is ascribed to Victorinus: but its genuineness is not unquestioned. Cave ^k says, 'it either is not his, or has been greatly interpolated: for Jerom informs us, that Victorinus held the millenarian opinion, which the author of this work dislikes.' Basnage ^l rejected this Commentary. Lampe ^m thought the more probable opinion to be that it is not his. Du Pin, after having observed the arguments for and against the genuineness of this work, concludes: 'We ⁿ cannot therefore be positive that this Commentary is not a work of Victorinus: on the contrary, there is some probability that it is his.' Tillemont ^p has treated this question modestly, and carefully, as usual. He owns that ^q there are some reasons to doubt of it: but it seems that there

sapiens, quam rex senex et inspiens: et, quod frequenter evenit, ut ille per sapientiam suam de carcere regis egrediens, imperet pro dominatore perverso; et rex inspiens perdat imperium, quod tenebat: super Christo et diabolo hunc locum interpretati sunt, quod puerum pauperem et sapientem, Christum velint, &c. Hier. in Ecc. T. ii. p. 741, fin.

^e De quo libro [Ecclesiastes] et Victorinus—nonnulla disseruit. Inst. Div. Lit. cap. 5. ^f Legisse me fateor—et Latinorum, Hilarii, Victorini, Fortunatiani opuscula. Hier. Pr. in Matth. p. 3, f.

^g De quo [Matthæo] et Victorinus ex oratore episcopus nonnulla disseruit. Cassiod. ib. c. vii. ^h De quo libro [Apo-

calypsi] et Victorinus sæpe dictus episcopus difficillima quædam loca breviter tractavit. Id. ib. c. ix. ⁱ Ap. Bib. P. P. T. iii. p. 414, &c. ^k Cav. ubi supr.

^l A Victorino tamen abjudicandum esse existimamus. Basnag. Ann. 303, n. xvi.

^m Quod eo minus congruum, cum librum hunc falso adscribi Victorino Pictaviensi, seu, ut aliis potius videtur, Pétavienensi, qui sub fine seculi tertii floruit, valde sit probabile. Lampe Proleg. in Joan. l. i. c. 4, n. xii. p. 66. ⁿ Du Pin Bib. des Ant. Ec. T. i. p. 194. ^o Au contraire il y a quelque apparence qu'il est de lui. ibid. ^p See St. Victorin de Pettau, Mem. Ec. T. v. P. ii. p. 218, et note 2.

^q Ib. p. 218.

are yet more to believe it a genuine remain of the many works of this holy martyr; only it must be allowed that what he had written in favour of the millenarian opinion has been altered: and he^r offers some reasons for thinking that what is now found in this Commentary upon that point is an interpolation, or addition. That passage is at the end of the piece, and it appears to be of a different style from the rest of the work. Moreover, there^s is some reason to suspect that alterations have been made in divers ancient writers who held that opinion: and what may more especially increase the suspicion here, is, that in this very Commentary there still seem to be some traces of that sentiment; where^r it is said that all the saints shall be assembled together in Judea to worship Christ. Whether it be Victorinus's or not, it is supposed to have in it divers marks of antiquity. Tillemont^u understands the author to speak of the senate of Rome, as still employing it's name and authority for persecuting the church. What he says of Nero, that^x he is to be raised up to be antichrist, is a more common notion of the first than of the latter ages. The author, y reckoning up the epistles of Paul, says nothing of the epistle to the Hebrews: and in the time of our bishop it was common in the West not to consider that as an epistle of St. Paul. It may be also observed that, z speaking of the prophet who is to come with Elias, he says nothing of Enoch; but informs us that some suppose him to be Moses, others Elisha: as for the author himself, he thinks it must be Jeremiah, whose death is not related in the scriptures: these may be reckoned marks of antiquity: and the style of the work answers very well to the character which Jerom gives of Victorinus's, as low and mean. So Tillemont: who nevertheless says, the^a safest way is not to be positive who is the author; and I assent to him. Though therefore I intend to make extracts out of this work, I desire it may be remembered that I do not quote it as certainly, but only probably, Victorinus's. I am willing to allow that in some places it has been interpolated and altered; but I am inclined to think it genuine in the main.

^r Ib. note ii. p. 444, et 445. ^s See Les Millenaires in Mem. Ec. T. ii. P. ii. p. 251. ^t — in Judæa, ubi omnes sancti conventuri sunt, et Dominum suum adoraturi. Victorin. ap. Bib. Patr. T. iii. p. 415. D. ^u Et vidi, inquit, mulierem ebriam de sanguine sanctorum, decreto senatus illius consummatæ nequitie, et omnem contra fidei prædicationem etiam latam indulgentiam ipse dedit decretum in universis gentibus. Id. ib. p. 420. H.

^v Unum autem de capitibus occisum in

morte, et plaga mortis ejus curata est, Nerone dicit. Constat enim, dum insequeretur eum equitatus missus a senatu, ipsum sibi gulam succidisse. Hunc ergo suscitatum Deus mittet regem dignum dignis, et Christum qualem meruerunt Judæi. ib. p. 420, D. ^y Id. ib. p. 415, E. ^z Multi putant eum Eliam esse, aut Elizeum, aut Moysen. Sed utrique mortui sunt. Hieremias autem mors non invenitur, quia omnes veteres nostri tradiderunt illum esse Hieremiam. p. 418. D. ^a Ubi supra, p. 446.

To this Commentary, as we now have it, is usually prefixed a prologue ascribed to St. Jerom: but there is so little reason to think it his, that no one, so far as I know, believes it to be authentic.

7. Beside these Commentaries Jerom says that Victorinus wrote against all heresies. This book, ^c or these books, if they were several, seem to be referred to by Optatus in Africa, who flourished not long before the year 370.

8. Jerom concludes in this manner: Victorinus wrote many other things. But we have no certain knowledge of any more than those named by him.

9. Cave ^d mentions two poems which have been published as his; but he thinks altogether without ground.

10. Tillemont says, 'that ^e many manuscripts ascribe to St. Victorinus of Pettau a hymn upon the cross, or upon Easter, or baptism; which ^f is among St. Cyprian's works. It has been observed that ^g Bede cites it as Victorinus's. It is a fine poem, and perhaps too fine for him. We thence perceive that many persons pretended to embrace the Christian religion, who did not persevere until baptism.' This is but a short poem: I do not intend to quote any thing out of it.

11. Tillemont adds, 'that ^h the poem against the Marcionites, among the works of Tertullian, may be ascribed to Victorinus: and this piece answers well enough to what Jerom says of Victorinus's small skill in the Latin tongue. This piece is of some considerable length.'

Indeed what Jerom says of our author might dispose us not to expect from him any Latin poetry: however, Bede has actually quoted some verses as his. And, since it is allowed that Victorinus did once teach rhetoric, possibly he might think fit sometimes to exercise his pen in verse as well as prose: but, when he writes Latin verse, we are not to expect that his style should appear very beautiful.

This poem is joined with Tertullian's works, but fully shewn, by ⁱ Rigaltius in his preface to it, not to be his: it stands there ^k

^b Ap. Bib. P. P. ib. p. 414.

^c Marcion, Praxeas, Sabellius, Valentinus, et ceteri, usque ad Cataphrygas, temporibus suis a Victorino Petavionensi, et Zephirino Urbico, et a Tertulliano Carthaginensi, et ab aliis adsertoribus ecclesiae catholicae superati sunt. Optat. l. i. cap. 9.

^d Tribuuntur autem ei carmina duo, quae habentur in sacrorum poetarum collectione Fabriciana. De Jesu Christo Deo et homine, unum. Alteri titulus est, Lignum Vitae. Sed conjectura plane incerta,

et, ut mihi videtur, falsa. Cav. in Victor. H. L. T. i. p. 147, Oxon. ^e Mem. E. T. v. P. ii. p. 218, 219, S. Victorin.

^f De Cruce Domini. p. 4, App. Cypr. Oxon. 1682.

^g Qua ductus opinione Victorinus Pictaviensis antistes ecclesiae, de Golgotha scribens ita inchoat, &c. Bed. de locis sanct. c. 2. p. 317, Cantabr. 1722.

^h Tillem. ib. p. 219. ⁱ Apud Tertullian. p. 796. Paris. 1634.

^k Incerti auctoris adversus Marcionem Libri quinque. Ib. p. 797.

with this title, Five books of an uncertain author against Marcion. Pearson¹ quotes it as a piece whose age is unknown; but yet, as it seems, not reckoning it to have been written till after the middle of the fifth century. From^m Cave we understand that Allix supposed this work was not published till after the time of Jerom. Bullⁿ asserted it to be a genuine work of Tertullian; which induced Tillemont to say, 'that^o by many instances it may be shewn, a critical skill in authors was not Bull's talent.'

I certainly do not think that this poem was written by Tertullian; nor do I perceive that we have sufficient evidence to ascribe it to our Victorinus: but as it is of some considerable length, and I do not now think of a better place for it, I shall here make some extracts, and take notice of several things in it.

1. This writer has a catalogue of the early^p bishops of Rome, among whom is Clement; who, he says, was acquainted with the apostles, or apostolical men.

2. He mentions^q Hermas, author of the Shepherd, whom he placeth in the time of pope Pius.

3. He takes notice of divers ancient^r heretics.

4. Speaking of Isaiah and Jeremiah, he says that^s the former was sawn asunder, and that the latter never died.

¹ Primus inter Latinos qui Pium suo loco posuit, erat Prosper in Chronicis a Labbeo edito. Quem secutus est Catalogus tertius Pseudo-Tertullianus, cujus ætas ignota est, lib. iii. Pearf. Opp. Post. p. 266, 267.

^m Doctissimus Allix libros adversum Marcionem post Hieronymi ævum natos arbitratur. Cav. in Tertulliano. Hist. L. T. i. p. 93. f.

ⁿ Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. iii. cap. 10, n. xix. p. 217.

^o On pourroit montrer par divers exemples, que la critique des ouvrages n'est pas le sort de Bullus. Mem. Ec. T. iii. P. i. p. 564.

^p Maxima Roma Linum, primum considerare jussit.

Post quem Cletus et ipse gregem suscepit ovilis.

Hujus Anaclethus successor sorte locatus.

Quem sequitur Clemens: is apostolicis bene notus. Adv. Marcion. l. iii. p. 803.

^q Post hunc deinde Pius, Hermas cui germine frater.

[ap. Tertullian.

Angelicus pastor, quia tradita verba locutus. ib. p. 803.

^r Hæc vobis per Marcionem, Cerdone magistro.

Namque Valentino Deus est insanus.

Tantos esse deos Basilidem credere jussit,

Quantos et dies annus habet.

Marcus per numeros argumentatus acute. l. i. p. 798.

Advenit Romam Cerdo — l. iii. p. 803.

Sub quo [Aniceto] Marcion hic veniens, nova pontica pestis. ibid.

^s Isaias, locuples vates, —

Quem populus sectum ligno, sine labe repertum,

Immeritum, demens crudeli morte peremit.

Sanctus Hieremias, quem gentibus esse prophetam

Æterna virtus jussit —

Nulla morte virum constat, neque cæde peremptum. l. iii. p. 802.

5. His canon of the Old Testament ^c seems to have been much the same with that of the Jews and protestants.

6. He often speaks ^u of the Old and New Testament, and of their entire agreement together; and that the law and the prophets and the apostles of Christ say one and the same thing.

7. He distinctly mentions the four ^x evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

8. He speaks of the sages that ^y came to Jerusalem after our Saviour's birth; and of the star that conducted them, as recorded in Matt. ii; and he seems to have thought that they were priests.

9. He ^z speaks of John the baptist, our Lord's forerunner, and calls him apostle.

10. He ^a enumerates many of our Lord's miracles. I omit other references to the gospels, for the sake of brevity.

11. This author in his poem expressly, and by name, quotes several of St. Paul's epistles, and plainly refers to divers others.

12. He also often ^b refers to the epistle to the Hebrews; and probably esteemed it an epistle of St. Paul.

13. He likewise ^c frequently quotes the book of the Revela-

^t Osea, Amos, et Michæas, Joel, Abdias, Jonas, Atque Naum, Abacuc, Sophonias, Aggæusque, Zacharias vim passus, et angelus ipse Malachim, &c. ib. et p. 803. in.

^u Adversum sese duo Testamenta sonare, Contra prophetarum Domini committere verba, l. ii. in. p. 799. Sic igitur lex, et miri cecinere prophetæ

Sic et apostolicæ voces testantur ubique.

Nec quidquam veteris non est novo denique junctum. l. iv. p. 804. a. f.

^x Cujus facta, simul dicta conjuncta, fideles Illi, Matthæus, Marcus, Lucaque, Joannes, Conscribere, mera, non extera verba locuti, Spiritu sancta Dei, tanto præsentem magistro. l. ii. p. 799. b.

^y Templi sacerdotes linquunt, stellæ quoque ductu Mirantur Dominum, tantum se cernere partum. l. i. p. 797. a.

^z Quem visum Joannes baptismi primus apertor, Et vatum socius, necnon et apostolus ingens, &c. l. ii. p. 800. a. in.

^a In vinum vertuntur aquæ, memorabile visu. Lumina redduntur cæcis, jussuque tremantes Damones expulsi clamant, Christumque fatentur. Omnia sanantur verbo jam tabida membra. Jam graditur claudus, surdus spem protinus audit. Dat dextram mancus, loquitur magnalia mutus. Fit mare tranquillum jussu, ventique quiescunt. l. i. p. 797. b.

^b Sanguine nam vituli populum, simul omnia vasa, Atque sacerdotes, et scripta volumina legis Sparsit aqua mixto. — l. i. p. 804, a. Conf. Hebr. ix. 19. Hoc Dominus noster, qui nos sua morte redemit, Extra castra, volens, populi vim passus iniqui. ib. Conf. Hebr. xiii. 12. et passim.

^c Federis hinc etiam novi inenarrabilis auctor Discipulus Joannes animas pro nomine passas Testatur tali sese vidisse sub ara. Clamantes Dei vindictam pro cæde potentis. l. iv. p. 804, b. Conf. Apoc. cap. vi. 9. Sic quoque Joannes, sic pandit Spiritus illi, Tot numero solio senioribus insuper albis, ib. p. 805, a. Conf. Apoc. cap. iv. 4.

tion, and calls it John's, and John's the disciple or apostle of Christ.

¹⁴. I need not take any thing more from this unknown author of the five books against Marcion: from what has been transcribed, it may be reckoned undoubted that he received all the books of the New Testament, generally received by Christians, and esteemed by them of authority: nor does there appear any sign of his receiving any other Christian writings in that manner.

IV. We return to Victorinus himself; to whom I intend to produce some more testimonies chiefly taken from Jerom: my readers will not be displeased to see them, as they will help them to some knowledge of this good man's character; which otherwise we could never be acquainted with, since the loss of the greatest part of his works.

We saw in the passage transcribed from Jerom's Catalogue, at the beginning of this chapter, he said that 'Victorinus understood Greek better than Latin; and that his works, though valuable for the sense, were mean as to the style.' In another place he says, 'that ^f Victorinus, who was crowned with a glorious martyrdom, was not able to express his thoughts.' In that place Jerom passeth his judgment upon several other Latin writers of the church; such as Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Arnobius, and Hilary. In his letter to Magnus he says, 'that ^s though the writings of the martyr Victorinus are not learned, they shew a good will to learning.' In another ^h place he calls Victorinus a martyr of blessed memory, who could say with the apostle: *though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge*: 2 Cor. xi. 6. He also informs us that ⁱ Victorinus, as well as many others, made great use of Origen's Commentaries upon the scriptures: he speaks of ^k this again; at the same time giving Victorinus the character of a man of renowned integrity. Once more, Victorinus ^l is mention-

^f Inclito Victorinus martyrio coronatus, quod intelligit, eloqui non potest. Ad Paulin. Ep. 49, [al. 13], T. iv. P. ii. p. 467. m. ^s Victorino martyri in libris suis licet desit eruditio, tamen non deest eruditionis voluntas. Ep. 83, [al. 84], ib. p. 656, f. ^h Ceterum apud Latinos grande silentium est, præter sanctæ memoriæ martyrem Victorinum, qui cum apostolo dicere poterat: etsi imperitus sermone, non tamen scientia. In H. Pr. p. 3, f.

ⁱ Taceo de Victorino Pictabionensi, et ceteris, qui Origenem in explanatione dumtaxat scripturarum sequuti sunt, et expresserunt. Ad Vigilant. Ep. 36, [al. 75],

p. 279, sub. fin.

^k Nec disertior sumus Hilario, nec fideiiores Victorino, qui ejus [Origenis] tractatus, non ut interpretes, sed ut auctores proprii operis transtulerunt. Ad. Pamin. et Ocean. Ep. 41, [al. 65], p. 346, in.

^l Si auctoritatem suo operi præstarebat, — habuit in promptu Hilarium Confessorem, — habuit Ambrosium, cujus pene omnes libri hujus sermonibus pleni sunt: et martyrem Victorinum, qui simplicitatem suam in eo probat, dum nulli molitur insidias. De his omnibus tacet, et quasi columnis ecclesiæ prætermisiss, me solum pulicem et nihili hominem confectatur. Adv. Ruf. l. i. p. 351.

ed with divers others, who are represented as very eminent persons, or pillars of the church: where the martyr Victorinus is again distinguished for his uncommon simplicity.

V. I shall make another short article of this writer's opinions.

1. He was a millenarian; as Jerom says, in his ^m chapter concerning Papias, and in ⁿ his Commentary upon Ezekiel.

2. It was formerly observed that ^o the author of the Commentary upon the Revelation supposed that Nero should be raised up from the dead to be antichrist. Since, therefore, this expected antichrist would ^p be the Messiah and king of the Jews, we may conclude that this writer did not suppose the famous antichrist would be an erroneous, or heretical and imperious, domineering Christian; but a man of another religion, particularly the Jewish religion. Consequently, since the author likewise ^q understood the man of sin, and son of perdition, in 2 Theff. ii. 3, to be the same as antichrist, he must have supposed the apostle there to speak of a man who is a Jew by religion at least.

Mr. La Roche published, in his New Memoirs of Literature ^r, a curious dissertation upon antichrist; where the author argues that the Jewish people were antichrist; and largely explains 2 Theff. ii. 1,—12. And there are in St. Cyril of Alexandria ^s many passages favouring that supposition.

I shall here insert in the ^t margin, for the sake of inquisitive

^m Hic dicitur mille annorum Judaicam edidisse *deuotum*, quam sequuti sunt Irenaeus,—et ceteri qui post resurrectionem aiunt in carne cum sanctis Dominum regnaturum. Tertullianus quoque in libro de spe fidelium, et Victorinus Petabionensis, et Lactantius, hac opinione ducuntur. De V. l. cap. 18.

ⁿ Quod et multi nostrorum, et praecipue Tertulliani liber, qui inscribitur de spe fidelium, et Lactantii institutionum volumen septimum pollicetur, et Victorini Petabionensis episcopi crebrae expositiones. Hier. in Ezech. cap. 36, T. iii. p. 952. in.

^o See p. 291.

^p Et bestia quam vidisti, inquit, de septem est: quoniam ante istos reges Nero regnavit,—Hunc ergo suscitatum Deus mittet regem dignum dignis, et Christum qualem meruerunt Judaei. Et quoniam aliud nomen allaturus est, aliam etiam vitam instituturus, ut sic cum tamquam Christum excipiant Judaei. Denique et sanctos non ad idola colenda revocaturus est, sed ad circumcisionem colendam. Victorin. ap. B. P. P. T. iii. p. 420. D.

^q Et Paulus contra antichristum ad Thessalonicenses ait: Quem Dominus interficiet spiritu oris sui. Id. ib. p. 415. C.

^r Vol. iv. p. 176,—209.

^s Vid.

Cyril. A. Comm. in Zach. T. iii. p. 769. C. D. p. 770. C. D. p. 773. D. Comm. in Joann. T. iv. p. 262. A. B. Vid. et T. v. p. 370. E. Et Conf. Dodw. Diss. i. in Iren. n. xiii.

^t Unde illam quidam deliri credunt esse translatum ac vivum reservatum, Sibylla dicente, Matricidam profugum a finibus esse venturum, ut, quia primus persecutus est, novissimus persequatur, et antichristi precedat adventum. Lactant. vel Cæcil. de Mort. Perséc. cap. 2. Cæterum ait nobis, — Neronem in Occidentali plaga regibus subactis decem imperaturum. — Ab antichristo vero Orientale imperium esse capiendum: qui quidem sedem et caput regni Hierosolymam esset habiturus: ab illo urbem et templum esse reparandum. Illius enim persecutionem futuram esse, ut Christum Dominum cogat negari, se potius Christum esse confirmans: omnesque secundum legem circumcidi jubeat. Sulpic. Sever. Dial. 2. cap. ult. Vid. et ejusd. Sacr. Hist. l. ii. c. 28, et 29. Unde et multi nostrorum putant ob sceleris et turpitudinis magnitudinem Neronem antichristum fore. Hieron. in Dan. xi. 27. Opp. T. iii. p. 1129. Con. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. xx, c. 19. et Comm. Instr. n. xli.

readers,

readers, passages of some other ancient Christians beside Victorinus, who speak of Nero's appearing as antichrist, or his forerunner; for they express themselves differently. The author of the Computation of Easter, of ^a whom I gave an account formerly, did not suppose that ^a antichrist would be a Christian.

3. Helvidius ^a alleged Victorinus as favouring his opinion, that Mary had children by Joseph after the birth of Jesus: but Jerom affirms that Victorinus did not understand by the Lord's brethren, mentioned in the gospels, sons of Mary, but in general relations or kindred.

VI. We are now to observe Victorinus's testimony to the scriptures, chiefly to the books of the New Testament: and the two pieces I shall make use of are the Commentary upon the Revelation, and the Fragment published by Cave, between both which there is a remarkable agreement.

1. In the Fragment, discoursing on the fourth day's work, he observes, beside other things, that ^a there are four living creatures before the throne of God, four gospels, four rivers in paradise. St. John's gospel is here quoted in this manner: 'The ^a evangelist John thus speaks: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*'

2. In the Commentary upon the Revelation he speaks of the gospels in this manner: 'The ^b four living creatures (see Rev.

^a See p. 198—200.

^a In quibus diebus ille antichristus magnam faciet vastationem. Et ideo tunc nemo Christianorum poterit Deo sacrificium offerre. De Pascha Comput. ap. Cypr. in App. p. 68. Ed. Oxon.

^b Sed quoniam — Tertullianum in testimonium vocat, et Victorini Petabionensis episcopi verba proponit: Et de Tertulliano quidem nihil amplius dico, quam ecclesie hominem non fuisse. De Victorino autem id assero, quod et de evangelistis, fratres eum dixisse Domini, non filios Mariae: fratres autem eo sensu, quem superius exposuimus, propinquitate, non natura. Adv. Helvid. T. iv. p. 147.

^a Ecce quatuor animalia ante thronum Dei, quatuor evangelia, quatuor flumina in paradiso fluentia. Victorin. de Fabrica Mundi ap. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 148, a.

^a Joannes evangelista sic dicit: In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum, &c. ib. p. 149, a.

^b Quatuor animalia, quatuor sunt evangelia. Primum inquit, simile leoni, secundum simile vitulo, tertium simile homini, quartum simile aquilae volanti. — Animalia igitur quod differentia

vultibus sunt, hanc habet rationem. Simile leoni animal, Evangelium secundum Marcum, in quo vox leonis in eremo rugientis auditur: Vox clamantis in deserto, Parate viam Domini. Hominis autem figura Matthaeus enititur enunciare nobis genus Mariae, unde carnem accepit Christus. Ergo dum enumerat ab Abraham usque ad David, et usque ad Joseph, tanquam de homine locutus est. Ideo praedicatio ejus hominis effigiem ostendit. Lucas sacerdotium Zachariae offerentis hostiam pro populo, et apparentem sibi angelum dum enarrat, propter sacerdotium, et hostiae conscriptionem, vituli imaginationem tenet. Joannes evangelista aquilae similis, assumptis pennis ad altiora festinans, de verbo Dei disputat. Marcus evangelista sic incipit: Initium evangelii Jesu Christi, sicut scriptum est in Isaia propheta, Vox clamantis in deserto. Haec est leonis effigies. Matthaeus: Liber generationis Jesu Christi, filii David, filii Abraham. Haec est facies hominis. Lucas autem dicit: Fuit sacerdos nomine Zacharias, de vice Abia, et mulier ei de filiabus Aaron. Haec est imago vituli. Joannes sic incipit: In principio erat Verbum, hoc erat in

iv. 6, 7) are the four gospels: *The first, says he, was like a lion, the second was like a calf, the third like a man, and the fourth like a flying eagle.* These living creatures have different faces, which have a meaning: for the living creature like a lion denotes Mark, in whom the voice of a lion roaring in the wilderness is heard: *A voice crying in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord.* Matthew, who has the resemblance of a man, shews the family of Mary, from whom Christ took flesh; and, while he computes his genealogy from Abraham to David and Joseph, he speaks of him as a man; therefore his preaching is represented by the face of a man. Luke, who relates the priesthood of Zacharias offering sacrifice for the people, and the angel that appeared to him, because of the priesthood and the mention of the sacrifice, has the resemblance of a calf. The evangelist John, like an eagle with stretched-out wings mounting on high, speaks of the Word of God. The evangelist Mark commences thus: *The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet; the voice of one crying in the wilderness:* this is the face of a lion. Matthew says: *The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham:* this is the face of a man. But Luke says: *There was a priest, named Zacharias, of the course of Abia; and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron:* this is the form of a calf. John begins thus: *In the beginning was the Word, the same was in the beginning with God:* this is the similitude of a flying eagle.

Thus in this passage we have the four evangelists, and the beginnings of their several gospels, or at least what is near the beginning of each of them. This passage, therefore, if it be really Victorinus's, as I see no reason to doubt, is very valuable.

3. He speaks of the time and of the occasion of St. John's writing his gospel: it was written after he had been confined in Patmos, and to confute and overthrow heresies then sprung up. 'By the reed like unto a rod, which was given to him, (see Rev. xi. 1), that he might measure the temple of God and the altar, and them that worship therein, is signified the power, which when set at liberty he exhibited to the churches; for he afterwards wrote his gospel. When Valentinus, and Cerinthus, and Ebion, and others of the school of Satan, were spread

principio apud Deum. Hæc est similitudo aquilæ volantis. Victorin. Comm. in Apoc. ap. Bib. P. P. T. iii. p. 416. F. G. H. Novissimam arundinem similem virgæ, ut metiretur Dei templum, et aram, et adorantes in ea, potestatem dicit, quam dimissus postea exhibuit ecclesiis.

Nam et evangelium postea scripsit. Cum essent Valentinus, et Cerinthus, et Ebion, et ceteri scholæ Satanæ diffusi per orbem, convenerunt, ad illum de finitimis provinciis omnes, et compulerunt, ut ipse testimonium conscriberet. In Apoc. ib. p. 418. C.

abroad

p. 217.

‘abroad over the world, all men [or all the churches] from the
 ‘the neighbouring provinces came to him, and earnestly en-
 ‘treated him to put down his testimony in writing.’

4. ‘And ^d we read in the Acts of the apostles, how, when he
 ‘was discoursing with his disciples, he was taken up into heaven.’
 See Acts i. 9,—11. Words of the Acts are ^e elsewhere quoted
 without naming the book.

5. In the Fragment published by Cave, in his observations
 upon the seventh day, when God rested from all his labours,
 among other remarkable instances of that remarkable number he
 mentions this: ‘And ^f seven churches in Paul.’ Cave says, ‘Per-
 ‘haps it should be in the Apocalypse:’ but the author means the
 seven churches which have epistles sent to them in the collection
 of St. Paul’s epistles. This will be apparent to all from a passage
 in the Commentary upon the Revelation; where, speaking of the
 seven churches mentioned in that book, to which likewise John
 sent epistles, he says: ‘That ^g in the whole world are seven
 ‘churches; and that those churches called seven are one catholic
 ‘church, Paul has taught: and that he might keep to it, he did
 ‘not exceed the number of seven churches; but wrote to the
 ‘Romans, to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Ephe-
 ‘sians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians.
 ‘Afterwards he wrote to particular persons, that he might not
 ‘exceed the measure of seven churches: and, contracting his
 ‘doctrine into a little compass, he says to Timothy: *That thou*
 ‘*mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the church of the*
 ‘*living God.*’

The reader cannot but recollect here what we formerly saw
 of the like kind in St. ^h Cyprian.

Here we have a very valuable testimony to St. Paul’s epistles,
 like to that which we saw before to the gospels. It may be
 hence justly concluded that he received thirteen epistles of the
 apostle Paul; that is, the second, as well as the first, to the Co-

^d Et nos legimus in Actis apostolorum, quemadmodum loquens cum discipulis suis, raptus est in celos. ib. p. 419. A.

^e Sicut Petrus ad Judæos exclamavit: Dextera Dei exaltatus acceptum a Patre Spiritum effudit, hunc quem videtis. (Act. ii. 33.) ib. p. 415. D.

^f Septem candelabra aurea, — septem mulieres apud Isaiam, septem ecclesie apud Paulum. de Fabr. Mund. ap. Cav. H. L. p. 149, a.

^g In toto orbe septem ecclesias omnes esse, et septem nominatas

unam esse catholicam, Paulus docuit primo: Quod ut servaret ipse, et ipsum septem ecclesiarum non excessit numerum. Sed scripsit ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses. Postea singularibus personis scripsit, ne excederet modum septem ecclesiarum. Et in brevi contrahens prædicationem suam, ad Timotheum ait: Ut scias, qualiter debeas conversari in ecclesia Dei vivi. In Apoc. p. 415. D. E.

^h See p. 169.

rinthians,

rinthians, and to the ⁱ Thessalonians, and all his epistles to particular persons; the first and second to Timothy, the epistles to Titus and Philemon.

6. But Victorinus makes no mention of the epistle to the Hebrews: and in what he says of the rest seems entirely to exclude it from the number of St. Paul's epistles. Nevertheless, there are in the Commentary upon the Revelation some passages which seem to contain allusions to this epistle: I think they deserve to be taken notice of.

1. 'For ^k our prayers ascend to heaven. As therefore heaven is denoted by the golden altar, which was the innermost, (for even the priests, who had the anointing, entered only once in the year to the golden altar, the Holy Ghost this signifying, that Christ should do this once for all:) in like manner, &c.' Compare Hebr. ix. 7, 8, 12.

2. Again: 'For ^l Moses himself taking moist wool, and the blood of a calf, and water, sprinkled all the people, saying: 'This is the blood of the testament, which God has enjoined unto you.' See Hebr. ix. 19, 20; and compare Exod. xxiv. 8, 9.

I have translated the former part of this passage nearly according to the Latin original; but I suppose that to be corrupted: perhaps it should be scarlet, instead of moist or wet, wool; and some other emendations might be thought of.

3. Presently after the author says: 'No ^m law is called a testament: nor is any thing else called a testament, but what men make who are about to die: and whatever is within a testament is concealed until the day of death:' see Hebr. ix. 16, 17.

Whether these will be allowed to be allusions to the epistle to the Hebrews; and, if they are, whether they can be sufficient, considering what he said before, to afford an argument that it was of authority with this writer; I cannot say. We proceed.

ⁱ He has more than once quoted the second epistle to the Thessalonians. Et Paulus contra antichristum ad Thessalonicenses ait: Quem Dominus interficiet spiritu oris sui. [2 Theff. ii. 8.] in Apoc. p. 415. C. Et Paulus apostolus confutatur. Ait enim ad Thessalonicenses: Qui nunc tenet teneat, &c. [2 Theff. ii. 7] ib. p. 418, F. ^k Utique ad cælum ascendunt orationes. Sicut igitur cælum intelligitur ara aurea, quæ erat interior; (nam et sacerdotes semel in anno introibant, qui habebant chrisma, ad aram au-

ream, significante Spiritu Sancto Christum hoc semel facturum;) sic et, — Victor. in Ap. ib. p. 418, B. ^l Nam et ipse tunc legis de populo, accepta lana succida, [forte coccinea,] et sanguine vituli, et aqua, aspersit populum universum, dicens: Hic sanguis testamenti eius, quod mandavit ad vos. ib. p. 417, E. ^m Nulla lex testamentum vocatur. Nec testamentum aliud dicitur, nisi quod faciunt morituri. Et quodcunque intrinsecus testamenti est, signatum est, usque ad diem mortis. ib. p. 417, E. F.

7. I have not observed in the remains of this author any quotations of the epistle of St. James.

8. Upon those words ^a of Rev. i. 6 : ‘ *And hath made us kings and priests* : that is,’ says he, ‘ the whole church of the faithful, as the apostle Peter says : [Ye are] *a holy nation, a royal priesthood* :’ 1 Pet. ii. 9.

9. I do not perceive any references to the second epistle of St. Peter, nor to any of the epistles of St. John, nor to that of St. Jude.

10. The Fragment in Cave concludes in this manner : ‘ These ^o are they, who sit before the throne of God, who in the Revelation of John, the apostle and evangelist, are called elders.’ And in the Commentary upon the Revelation he several times ascribes that book to John. ‘ The ^p opened book,’ says he, ‘ is the Revelation which John saw.’ Afterwards ^q he calls him apostle : and soon after he informs us when John saw and wrote the Revelation. ‘ And ^r he said unto me : *Thou must prophesy again to people, and tongues, and nations* : (Rev. x. 11.) that is, because when John saw this he was in the isle of Patmos, having been condemned to the mines by the emperor Domitian : there he saw the Revelation. And when, being now old, he expected to be received up [to heaven] through his sufferings, Domitian was killed, and all his acts disannulled, and John was set at liberty from the mines. Then afterwards he wrote the same Revelation, which he had received from the Lord. This is the meaning of those words : *Thou must prophesy again*.’ In another place he says : ‘ When ^s the scripture of the Revelation was published, Domitian was emperor.’

11. We have already seen some forms of citation : a particular or two may be added. ‘ The ^t other three horses,’ says he, ‘ signify the wars, famines, and pestilences, more plainly spoken

^a Et fecit nos regnum et sacerdotes : id est, omnem fidelium ecclesiam, sicut Petrus apostolus dicit : Gens sancta, regale sacerdotium. ibid. p. 414. H. ^o — quos in Apocalypsi Joannis apostoli et evangelizæ seniores vocat. Ap. Cav. H. Lit. T. i. p. 149. ^p Liber apertus Apocalypsis est, quam Johannes vidit. ubi supra, p. 419. E. ^q Sed quia dicit, se scripturum fuisse Joannes quanta locuta fuissent tonitrua, id est, quæcunque in veteri testamento erant obscura et prædicata, vetatur scribere, sed relinquere ea signata, qui erat apostolus, nec oportebat gratiam sequentis gradus in primo collocari. ib. F. ^r — Hoc est, quoniam quando hoc vidit Joannes, erat in insula Pathmos, in

metallum damnatus a Domitiano Cæsare. Ibi ergo vidit apocalypsin. Et cum senior jam putaret se per passionem accepturum receptionem, interfecto Domitiano, omnia judicia ejus soluta sunt, et Joannes de metallo dimissus. Sic postea tradidit hæc eandem quam acceperat a Domino apocalypsin. Hoc est, Oportet te iterum prophetare. ib. G. ^s Intelligi oportet tempus, quo scriptura apocalypsis edita est, quoniam tunc erat Cæsar Domitianus — unus exstat, sub quo scribitur apocalypsis, Domitianus scilicet. p. 420. C.

^t Cæteri tres equi bella, fames, pestes in evangelio a Domino prædicata manifestius significant. p. 417. H.

‘of by the Lord in the gospel.’ ‘For^u the Lord says: *This gospel shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto the nations, and then shall the end come:* Matt. xxiv. 14. Presently afterwards: ‘As^x we read in the gospel: *Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:*’ ver. 7. ‘And^y so the Lord says in the gospel: *Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains:*’ ver. 16. And in like manner often. ‘And^z the Jews saying, *Forty and six years has this temple been building,* the evangelist says: *He spake of the temple of his body:*’ John ii. 20, 21. Having quoted Matth. xiii. 52. *Therefore every scribe instructed to the kingdom of God is like unto an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old,* he says: ‘The^a new things are the words of the gospel; the old those of the law and the prophets.’ By *the words of the gospel, or evangelic words,* meaning, as it seems, the whole New Testament. After his long account of the four gospels, and their symbolical representations before transcribed, he observes: ‘All^b these, though four, are one, because they proceed from one mouth.’ Explaining some words in the Revelation, he says: ‘They^c confute those who say that one spake in the prophets, and another in the gospel.’ Again, ‘The^d doctrine of the Old Testament is connected with the New.’ He^e often speaks of the Old and New Testament.

12. We have seen then in Victorinus very valuable testimonies to the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, thirteen of St. Paul’s epistles, and some expressions which may be thought allusive to the epistle to the Hebrews, as also a plain quotation of the first epistle of St. Peter, beside his express testimony to the author of the book of the Revelation, and his Commentary upon it. And there might be other books received by him, as of authority, though not expressly mentioned in his few remaining works. Unquestionably he received all those scriptures of the New Testament, which were generally received by Christians in all times, and all over the world. We have also observed him to speak distinctly of a collection of sacred writings, called the gospel, and the New Testament. Finally, we should not forget

^u Ait enim Dominus: Prædicabitur, &c. ib. H. ^x Ut legimus in evangelio: Surget enim gens, &c. ib. ^y Sic et Dominus in evangelio ait: Tunc qui in Judea sunt, &c. p. 419. H. ^z Evangelista inquit: Ille dicebat de templo corporis sui. p. 418. G. ^a Nova evangelica verba: vetera legis et prophetarum. ib. p. 415. B. ^b Hæ prædicationis,

quamvis quatuor sunt, una est tamen, quia de uno ore processit. p. 416. A.

^c Arguit qui alium in prophetis, alium in evangelio dicunt esse locutum. p. 416. D.

^d Conjuncta veteris testamenti prædicatio cum novo. p. 417. F.

^e Sic nec prædicatio novi testamenti fidem habet, nisi habeat veteris testamenti prænuntiata testimonia. p. 417. A.

here the evidences we saw at the beginning of this chapter of Victorinus's writing Commentaries upon several books of the Old Testament, and some of the New; proofs of his application and industry, and of his unfeigned affection and ardent zeal for the holy scriptures, and for the Christian religion: which he recommended not only by the labours of his life, but also by the patience and fortitude of a violent, but willing, death for it's sake.

C H A P. LVII.

METHODIUS, bishop of Olympus in Lycia.

I. *His history.* II. *His works.* III. *Testimonies to him.* IV. *Selected passages of Methodius.* V. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament: and first, of the four gospels:* VI. *Of the Acts of the apostles:* VII. *Of St. Paul's epistles:* VIII. *Of the epistle to the Hebrews:* IX. *Of the catholic epistles:* X. *Of the Revelation.* XI. *Forms of quoting, general divisions, and respect for the scriptures.* XII. *Texts explained.* XIII. *The sum of his testimony.*

I. 'METHODIUS, ^a bishop of Olympus in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre, a man of a neat and correct style, composed a work against Porphyry in several books. He also wrote a Banquet of ten virgins; Concerning the Resurrection, against Origen, an excellent book; and against him likewise Of the Pythoness; and Of liberty, [or free will;] Commentaries also upon Genesis and the Canticles; and many other works, which are in the hands of every body. He obtained the crown of martyrdom at Chalcis in Greece, at the end of the last persecution; or, as some say, under Decius and Valerian.'

So writes Jerom in his book of Illustrious men. Eusebius makes no mention of Methodius in his Ecclesiastical history. The reason of it has been supposed by many learned men to be, that Methodius had written against Origen, whom Eusebius greatly admired. Nay, Valefius says, moreover, it ^b was out of

^a Methodius Olympi Lyciæ, et postea Tyri episcopus, nitidi compositique sermonis, adversus Porphyrium confecit libros; et Symposium decem virginum, de resurrectione opus egregium contra Origenem, et adversus eundem de Pythonissa, et de autexufo. In Genesim quoque, et

in Cantica Canticorum commentarios; et multa alia, quæ vulgo lætitantur. Et ad extremum novissimæ persecutionis, sive, ut alii affirmant, sub Decio et Valeriano, in Chalcide Græciæ, martyrio coronatus est. De V. I. cap. 83. ^b Nam cum omnes ecclesiasticos scriptores in hoc opere

envy and hatred of Methodius, that Eusebius wrote after him against Porphyry. But this last supposition appears to me uncharitable: however, we are informed by Jerom that ^e Eusebius, in his Apology for Origen, complained of Methodius for writing against Origen, after he had more than once spoken of his sentiments without any censure or dislike. And from the accounts we have of the works of Methodius, and some remaining extracts out of them, it appears, that not only several of his pieces were written against Origen, but likewise that he sometimes treated that great man not very civilly.

Socrates ^d writes, that Methodius, after he had long opposed Origen, as if he recanted what he had said, commended him in a dialogue, called Zeno. Tillemont ^e thinks Socrates is not to be credited herein: and ^f Baronius long ago charged that ecclesiastical historian with being guilty of a manifest falsehood in this account: for he says the quite contrary is the truth, as we learn from Eusebius himself: Methodius first approved of Origen, and afterwards wrote against him. Besides, how should Socrates become acquainted with this recantation of Methodius, which is unknown to every body else; which Eusebius, Rufinus, and other defenders of Origen, say nothing of? Whereas, says Baronius, if they had known it they would have transcribed it in letters of gold, and shewn it every where. On the other hand ^g Valefius, ^h Huet, and ⁱ Pagi, maintain the truth of the relation in Socrates. But it seems to me not impossible that Socrates mistook the time of writing that dialogue, which might be written before Methodius had taken a disgust against Origen. Or, if indeed it was written afterwards, as Socrates supposed, I think it reasonable to conclude the commendation there given Origen was a small matter of no great moment, and far short of a recantation. Baronius's reasoning appears solid: if Methodius had recanted what he had written against Origen, it would have been mentioned by his apologists. I suppose the meaning of

accurare commemoraverit, Methodium tamen de industria prætermisit, eo quod Origenem, quem ipse præcipue mirabatur, impugnavisset. Hinc etiam est, quod contra Porphyrii libros, post eundem Methodium scripsit: quasi æmulatione quadam et odio adversus Methodium incitatus. Valef. Ann. in Euf. l. vi. c. 33, p. 128, B.

^c Eusebius Cæsariensis episcopus, cujus supra memini, in sexto libro *απολογίας* Origenis hoc idem objicit Methodio episcopo et martyri, quod tu in meis laudibus criminarius, et dicit: quomodo ausus est

Methodius nunc contra Origenem scribere, qui hæc et hæc de Origenis loquutus est dogmatibus? Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruf. l. 1, p. 359, Bened. ^d *Μεθόδιος μὲν οὐ*

πολλὰ καταδραμὼν τῷ Ὀριγῆνι, ὑστερὶν ὡς ἐκ παλινωδίας θάυμαζεν τὸν ἄνδρα ἐν τῷ διαλόγῳ, ὃ ἐπεγράφη ξενία. H. E. l. vi. cap. 13. p. 320, A. ^e Tillem. St. Methode Mem. Ecc. T. v. P. iii. p. 139. 140.

^f Baron. Ann. 402, n. xvii. ^g Valef. ad Socr. l. vi. c. 13. ^h Huet Origenian. l. ii. c. iv. num. ii. ⁱ Pagi Crit. 402, n. iii.

Eusebius's

p. 131.

Eusebius's words above cited by Jerom to be this: That Methodius in his own writings, in several places, had treated of several sentiments that were disliked in Origen; and that Methodius in those more early pieces appeared to be much of the same opinion with Origen: but afterwards he wrote against him with a good deal of bitterness; of this conduct Eusebius complained. And it has been observed by ^k Tillemont, that in the Banquet of the ten Virgins, probably ^l one of the first books published by our author, there are several sentiments very near resembling those called Origen's. Methodius, says that learned writer, in one place ^m very nearly follows the opinion of Origen upon the preexistence of souls, which are at length sent from heaven into bodies. He ⁿ seems also to say, (as Origen was accused,) that in the glory of heaven men shall be changed into the nature of angels. These things, not to insist now on any other, are found in that Banquet.

Upon the whole, as Eusebius was not unacquainted with Methodius, and has been careful to mention a great number of ecclesiastical writers in his history, his silence about this bishop may be very probably ascribed to the cause above-mentioned, his displeasure against him for writing against Origen, and treating him roughly: that silence must also be reckoned an argument, that Methodius did never retract: for that would have been much for Origen's honour; it would have reconciled his admirers to Methodius, and they would have spoken of it frequently, and Eusebius would not have failed to give him an honourable place in his Ecclesiastical History.

There ^o are considerable difficulties about the place of which Methodius was bishop. Jerom said above, that he was at first bishop of Olympus. Socrates too says expressly, and at length, that he ^p was bishop of a city in Lycia, called Olympus. He ^q is now very commonly called bishop of Patara, and at other times of Tyre. Suidas ^r says, Methodius was bishop of Olympus in Lycia, or of Patara, and afterwards of Tyre: in which words there is supposed to be an ambiguity: for they may mean, that Olympus was sometimes called Patara; or, that it is doubtful which of those two places he was bishop of: but, that Pata-

^o As before, p. 138. ^l Ib. p. 136.

^m —τη ἀπο τῶν θρανίων εἰς τὰ σωματὰ μεταβαίνει καὶ καταποιεῖ τὸν ψυχῶν.
Method. Conv. ap. Combef. Aud. Nov.
ⁿ p. 74, C. ⁿ ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν χλιδιότητά τοι μεταβληθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ σχήματος τῆς αἰσθητικῆς καὶ τῆς φθορᾶς, εἰς ἀγγέλους μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἄλλος. Ib. p. 429, A.

^o Tillem. as before, p. 132, & sur St. Methode Note 1. ^p —Μεθόδιος, τῆς ἐν Λυκίᾳ πόλεως Ὀλύμπου ἐπίσκοπος.

Socr. I. vi. c. 13. ^q See Till. as before, note ^o.

^r Μεθόδιος, Ὀλύμπου Λυκίας, ἡνὶ Πάταρον, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τῆς ἐπίσκοπος. Suid.

ra and Olympus were two different places might be shewn. They ¹ are expressly named by Strabo, as two of the six large cities of Lycia: and how he should be bishop of both is not easy to conceive.

Jerom says that Methodius was afterwards bishop of Tyre; and so likewise Suidas from him, or from his Greek interpreter Sophronius: which yet is not easy to be accounted for, nor very probable; such removals or translations of bishops not being then very common. Tillemont ¹ thinks that if Methodius was bishop of Tyre, he must have succeeded Tyrannio, a worthy pastor of that church, particularly mentioned by ² Eusebius, as one of the illustrious martyrs of Dioclesian's persecution, who was drowned in the sea near Antioch.

It is, however, very likely that Methodius was for some time, if not to the end of his life, bishop of Olympus in Lycia: since Socrates gives him that title, as well as Jerom. Besides, in one of his works, he ³ informs us of a wonderful thing he had seen upon Olympus, a mountain of Lycia; which, according to ⁴ Strabo, adjoined to the city of the same name.

In Jerom's days there were two different opinions about the time of this person's death; for some thought he suffered under Decius or Valerian: but this opinion is inconsistent with his writing against Porphyry, who did not publish his books against the Christians till about the year 270. The other is Jerom's own opinion, that Methodius had the honour of martyrdom at the end of the last, or Dioclesian's persecution: therefore in the year 311 or 312, as ⁵ Tillemont shews; not in the year 302, or 303, as Du Pin ⁶ says, if his numbers are rightly printed in my edition. Methodius is placed by Cave as flourishing about the year 290, against which I have no exceptions to make: for it is not unlikely that he was ordained bishop about that time.

But though the above-mentioned opinion of Jerom concerning the time of the death of Methodius may be reckoned very probable, yet what he says about the place of it is not very easy to be ^b received.

In this uncertainty are we about several material things relating to Methodius: which may be imputed partly to his own modesty, who had said little of himself in his works; and partly, and chiefly, to the neglect, or the resentment and ill-will of Euse-

¹ Strab. l. 14, p. 665, A. ² As before, p. 133.

³ Euf. l. viii. cap. 13, p. 307, 308.

⁴ Vid. Excerpt. ex libr. de Resurr. ap. Comb. p. 301, ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 924.

⁵ Ubi supra, p. 666.

⁶ See Till. as before, p. 133, and note 2.

⁷ Du Pin Bibl. des Aut. Ecc. T. i. p. 195, à Amst.

⁸ Till. as above, p. 133, and note 3.

bⁱus: who, it is likely, could have left us good memoirs of him, if he had pleased.

Thus much we may rely upon, that he was bishop, and probably of Olympus in Lycia, as was before shewn; and that the same bishop suffered death for the Christian religion, probably in the persecution begun under Dioclesian: and, beside what we have already seen from Jerom and others, it may be observed here, that he is called bishop and martyr by ^c Photius, and by ^d Theodoret. Hereafter I may add some more passages confirming these particulars.

I shall conclude the brief history of this person with one observation: it is an obvious thought, and a conjecture likely to arise in the minds of not a few, that, since Methodius is said to have been bishop of so many places, and there were in Jerom's time two very different opinions concerning the time of his death, possibly there were two of this name in the third century, both bishops and martyrs; one somewhat obscure, the other well known, for his writings at least.

II. Of these we have a pretty good account left us: and I must take some notice of them before I proceed to make extracts.

1. The first mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue is the work or books against Porphyry, which in another place he says ^e amounted to ten thousand lines. St. Jerom has spoken of this work more than once in his Commentary ^f upon the book of Daniel, and ^g elsewhere. Of this work there is now nothing remaining, except ^h a few fragments, which are but of small consequence. The three chief writers against Porphyry were Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius: and ⁱ Philostorgius, as we are informed by Photius, gave the preference to Apollinarius above the other two.

2. The next piece mentioned by Jerom, as above, is the Banquet of ten Virgins, or Of Chastity. Out of this work, which is a dialogue, there are large extracts in ^k Photius: and we still have it ^l entire, answerable to the quotations made by the ancients. Photius indeed censures this work: he says there are in it Arian and other erroneous opinions, and ^m therefore suspects it to have been interpolated: but that suspicion is now judged groundless by most of the learned ⁿ moderns.

^c Cod. 235, p. 932. ^d Dialog. i. p.

37. ^e Methodius usque ad decem mil-

lia procedit versuum. Hieron. Ep. 83, [al.

84.] ^f In Dan. Pr. et cap. xii. v. ult.

^g Adv. Ruf. l. 2. p. 433, in. T. iv. P.

ii. et Ep. 30, [al. 50] p. 236, in ib.

^h ap. Combefis. p. 442, &c. ⁱ οτι,

φασιν, απολλινάριος; κατα πορφυριον γραψας

επι πολυ κρατιω των ηγωνισμενων ευσεβειω

κατ' αυτην, αλλα και της μεθωδου κατα της

αυτης υποθεσεως σπουδασματων. Philost. H.

E. l. viii. c. 14. ^k Cod. 237, p. 949,

&c. ^l ap. Combef. Auct. p. 64, &c.

^m — μεθωδευμενος εστι ευρησις γαρ ειν

αυτη παραβλημενης και αρισταρικής δοξολο-

γιας, και ετερων τινων κακοδοξωντων μεθωδο-

γηματα. ib. p. 964, f. ⁿ Du Pin Bibl.

T. i. p. 198, Till. as before, p. 138, Baf-

nag. Ann. 300, n. ix.

3. The book of the Resurrection, written against Origen, is called by Jerom an excellent work: this too was a dialogue: there are large extracts out of it in ° Photius: and Epiphanius † transcribed a good part of it into his work against heresies.

4. Of the next work mentioned by Jerom, Of the Pythoness, or the cunning woman, whom Saul consulted, likewise against Origen, nothing now remains.

5. Nor have we any thing of his Commentaries upon Genesis, or the Canticles, that is considerable, and that can be relied upon.

6. There are large extracts in Photius out of the treatise † Of Free-will; or, Of the Origin of Evil. Tillemont † observes, that Jerom seems to say, this work also was written against Origen: but this does not appear by what Combefis has given. He adds, it is a dialogue, in which an orthodox person confutes two Valentinians. Fabricius † however says, this treatise was written against the Valentinians and Origen.

7. Photius † has also extracts out of another work of Methodius, entitled, Of the Creatures, not mentioned by Jerom. This book was plainly written against Origen, whom † he here more than once calls centaur; as † if he had been some compound creature, partly heathen, partly Christian; or, as Fabricius expresseth it, because † he mixed things sacred and profane, Christian and heathen principles all together.

8. We now plainly perceive that there were at least three or four pieces of Methodius written against Origen, and that he sometimes treated that great man in an offensive manner: and, if the homily or tract, to be hereafter mentioned, concerning Simeon and Anna be his, we have another instance of his ill-will to Origen. This is one of the arguments of Combefis for the genuineness of that † work, that the author opposeth Origen: but, supposing this not to be written by Methodius, we have nevertheless a good deal of evidence of his aversion to that eminent person: and I think this must be allowed to make a kind of apology for Eusebius; though I heartily wish he had not carried his resentment so far as he seems to have done. He had good reason, we will suppose, to be displeased with Methodius,

° Cod. 234, p. 908, &c. † Epiph. Hær. 64, a pag. 534, ad 590. et ap. Combef. Bib. Patr. p. 283, &c. † ap. Phot. Cod. 236, p. 940, et Combef. Bib. p. 347, &c. † Ib. p. 142. † Vid. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 256. † Cod. 235. † οτι ο Ωριγενης, ον κενταυρον καλει, κ. λ. Cod. 235, p. 933, ver. 28. Παλιον δε ου, κ κενταυροι. ib. p. 936, ver. 52.

* Christianam denique fidem Hippocentaurum facite, nec equum perfectum, nec hominem. Faust. Manich. l. 15. ap. Aug. T. viii. p. 571, F. † Quod nempe sacra profanis atque Christiana Ethnicis miscuisset dogmata. Fabr. ib. p. 256.

† Vid. Method. Combefis. p. 427, 469, 473, not. 42.

and he might well censure and blame him for treating Origen as he did: nevertheless, he should have given Methodius a place among other ancient worthies in his Ecclesiastical History.

9. Theodoret ^a has quoted a passage of Methodius out of a piece entitled, A Discourse of Martyrs; of which there is nothing else remaining. I shall take notice of that passage hereafter.

10. Nor have we any thing of the dialogue called Xeno, which we before observed to be taken notice of by Socrates.

11. I think I have now put down the titles of all the works of Methodius, expressly mentioned by the ancients: however, it is not improbable that he wrote more; for Jerom says there were many other beside those mentioned by him. Eusebius's passage above cited from Jerom seems to imply, that Methodius had written some good number of books before he became an enemy to Origen: and he might afterwards also write some other, which we are not acquainted with.

12. And there are actually several other ^b things now extant which are ascribed to him: such as, a Homily concerning Simeon and Anna; another Homily upon our Saviour's entrance into Jerusalem; and Revelations, and a Chronicle.

These two last I think are generally rejected as not genuine.

The second likewise I suppose is defended by very few.

But the first homily, concerning Simeon and Anna, has more patrons. Not only ^c Combefis, and some others, but ^d Fabricius likewise pleads it's genuineness. On the other hand, Tillemont ^e allows, there is no good reason to take it for a work of our Methodius. Oudin ^f strenuously opposeth it, and thinks it the composition of some other Methodius, later than ours by several centuries; as does ^g Cave. Du Pin ^h says that 'it is not cited by the ancients, nor abridged by Photius. The author speaks so clearly of the mysteries of the trinity, of the incarnation, and the divinity of the Word, who he more than once says is consubstantial with the Father; of the hymn called Trisagion, of the virginity of Mary, even after her delivery; and of original sin; that there is room to doubt whether some-what has not been added to this homily: beside that the style is more verbose, and fuller of epithets than that of Methodius.' So that learned writer. And in my opinion these particulars are sufficient to assure us, that either this homily is not genuine,

^a Vid. Theodoret. Dial. i. p. 37.

p. 469.

^d Fabr, ut supra, p. 257.

^b See Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. v. P. iii. as before, p. 144, et notes 6 & 7, sur. St. Methode. Vid. etiam Fabric, ut supra, p. 157, 158.

^e Tillem. as before, p. 136, & 144, & note vi. ^f De Script. Ecc. T. i. p. 303, &c. ^g Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 152.

^h Vid. Combef. in Method.

^h Du Pin, as before, p. 200.

(which I rather think), or else it has been so interpolated as to be very little worth. Of this, and some other things ascribed to Methodius, Grabeⁱ honestly says, they are either supposititious, or interpolated. I shall therefore make no use of this piece; or, if I do, I shall give notice of it particularly.

III. I shall now put down a few testimonies to Methodius, beside those already observed in the history of him, and in the account of his works: there is the more need of this because of Eusebius's silence. Epiphanius, who inserted a large part of the dialogue concerning the resurrection into his work, *Against Heresies*, calls^k Methodius a blessed man; and^l afterwards gives him the character of a learned or eloquent man, and a zealous defender of truth. Jerom has given Methodius a place in his^m letter to Magnus among other ancient Christian writers of note; and when he cites him, in his *Commentary upon Daniel*, he calls himⁿ the most eloquent martyr Methodius. Andrew of Cæsarea, about the year 500, in his *Commentary upon the book of the Revelation*, often cites this writer, and more than once calls him^o the great Methodius; a title which he gives likewise to Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and some other ancient writers. He also calls Methodius^p a blessed man: quoting him and Hippolytus, he calls them^q saints, or holy men. More testimonies to our author may be seen in^r Leo Allatius, who is a great admirer of Methodius, and^s prefers him to Origen: but surely that judgment is owing to partiality and prejudice. Methodius had wit and learning as well as piety: so much ought to be owned: but why he should be equalled, and even preferred to Origen, I cannot see. Doubtless Socrates would allow the four writers, whom he mentions, as enemies of Origen, (of whom Methodius is the first) a good share of learning. Nevertheless, sensible of their inferiority to that eminent person, and offended at the manner in

ⁱ Cæterum prostat quidem unus insuper et alter Methodii tractatus, e quibus plura, eaque luculentissima, pro — catholica trinitatis professione testimonia allegari possent. Sed ab iis abstineo, quod tractatus isti aut supposititii, aut interpolati esse videntur. Grab. Annot. ap. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 13, in fin.

^k ὑπο τῇ μακαρίῃ Μεθοδίου. Epiph. Hær. 64. c. 11, p. 534. C.

^l Μεθοδίου ἀνδρὶ λογίῳ ὄντι, καὶ σφοδρὰ περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀγωνισαμένῳ. id. ib. c. 63, p. 591. A.

^m Ep. 83, [al. 84]. ⁿ Et ex parte disertissimus vir martyr Methodius. in Dan. cap. xii. vers. ult.

^o Ὁ δὲ μέγας Μεθοδίου. Andr. in Apoc. p. 63. A. Vid. et p. 66. B. 124. B.

^p ib. p. 64. E.

^q τοὺς δὲ ἁγίους, Μεθοδίῳ καὶ Ἰππολύτῳ, κ. λ. p. 70. E.

^r Vid. Leon. Allat. de Method. Scriptis Diatriba. ap. Hippolyt. Ed. Fabric. P. ii. p. 76, &c.

^s Fuit ingenium, et doctrina maxima Origenis. Eam si cum Methodiana conferas, habet quod laudari possit, et debeat; tamen vilescere videtur, et dissoluta viribus fluere. Contra, Methodiana est, quæ semper vigens, florens, pungens, concitans, auditorem vellicat et rapit. Mortua est Origeniana loquacitas, si cum Methodiana brevitate conferatur. Una Methodii pagina et luminibus oratorius et sententiis, et pietate, et eruditione firma ac integra centum Origenis paginas exæquat. Leon. Allat. ib. num. xvi. p. 83.

which

which they had treated him, he applies to them this observation :
 ' That ^c mean and obscure people, who are unable to shine by
 ' their own merit, endeavour to make themselves considerable by
 ' detracting from others. The first,' says he, ' who was seized
 ' with this distemper, was Methodius, bishop of a city in Lycia,
 ' named Olympus.' The other three mentioned by Socrates are
 Eustathius, Apollinarius, and Theophilus of Alexandria.

IV. Before I proceed to this author's testimony to the books
 of the New Testament, I shall transcribe a few select passages :
 they will be agreeable to some of my readers; and may be of
 use to give some idea of the state of theology in those days.

1. In his book Of the Creatures, as we are informed by Pho-
 tius, he said that ^u the book of Job was written by Moses.

2. In his remaining fragments he twice ^x quotes the book
 of Wisdom as Solomon's.

3. He says that ^y God having made the world appointed an-
 gels as governors and presidents under himself. ' But ^z the devil
 ' fell, through envy of us, and afterwards many other angels ad-
 ' mitted fleshly desires, and fell in love with the daughters of
 ' men : ' which opinion doubtless is founded upon a wrong in-
 terpretation of the sixth chapter of Genesis. Du Pin, through
 haste, or some other cause, has ^a strangely misrepresented this
 passage of Methodius; supposing him to ascribe the fall of the
 devil, as well as the other angels, to this last temptation.

4. Methodius ^b had a notion that the divine Word was incar-
 nate in Adam : he builds this doctrine upon what St. Paul writes
 in Eph. v. 31, 32, and says, that ^c Adam was not only a type
 ' and figure, but Christ, forasmuch as the Word, who was before
 ' all ages, dwelled in him ; for it was fit and reasonable, that the
 ' first-begotten of God, and the first and only begotten, even
 ' Wisdom, joining itself to man, should be incarnate [or, be-
 ' come man,] in the first-made and first and first-born of men.'
 This Methodius will have to be orthodox, or the right interpre-

^u Socrat. H. E. l. vi. c. 13, in.

^v Οτι το Ιωβ βιβλιον, Μωσως ισαι ο αγιος
 φησι. Cod. 235, p. 937, f. ap. Combef. p.
 345. A.

^x — καθ' απ' αυτου και η σοφια
 Σολομωνος μαρτυρει. ap. Epiphan. Hæc. 64.
 n. xix. p. 543. A. Vid. ib. n. xxxvi.

^y ap. Epiphan. ib. n. xxi. in. et ap.
 Phot. Cod. 234, p. 908, fin.

^z Ο δε ενδρισι, και ποικλος περι των πι-
 πιστευμενων γινετο την διοικησιν, φθονοι ενχισ-
 στας καθ' ημων' ωσπερ και οι μετα ταυτα
 σαρκων ιρασθεντες, κ. λ. ib. ap. Epiphan.
 p. 544. B.

^a — que le peché a esté
 causé par l'envie du diable, et que le diable
 même, qui avoit esté créé dans la justice

semblable aux autres anges. est tombé par
 le peché d'envie, et par l'amour déréglé,
 qu'il a eu pour les filles. Du Pin. Bib. T.
 i. p. 198.

^b Concerning this matter
 see Beaufobre, Hist. de Maniché, &c. T.
 ii. p. 317, 318.

^c Φερει γαρ ημεις επι-
 σκεψαμεθα πως ορθοδοξης απγαγε τον Αδαμ
 εις τον Χριστον, η μονον τυπον αυτου ηγμενος
 ισαι και εικονα, αλλα και αυτο τυτο Χριστον
 και αυτον γιγονειναι, δια το τον προ αιωνων εις
 αυτον ενκατασκηφαι λογον. Ημεοις γαρ το
 πρωτογονον τε Θειν και πρωτον και μονογενες
 την σοφιαν, τον πρωτοπλαστω και πρωτω
 και πρωτογονω των ανθρωπων ανθρωπω κηρασ-
 θησαν επιθρηνηκισαι. Method. Conv. p.

tation of St. Paul: but ^d Combefis, in opposition to a learned modern who would justify this passage, argues, that it cannot be reconciled to sound doctrine. I shall presently transcribe from Methodius what follows in the same place.

5. Some while ago we saw the censure which Photius passed upon the writings of Methodius; that they had in them the Arian doctrine, and therefore were interpolated as he suspected: but learned moderns, not perceiving any marks of interpolation, have thought themselves obliged to admit that Methodius Arianised. Bishop Bull ^e indeed, and ^f Grabe after him, maintain the orthodoxy of this bishop and martyr. Du Pin ^g likewise thinks that Methodius may be very well defended from the accusation of erring about the trinity: but ^h Tillemont says it is very difficult to put a good sense upon some of his expressions concerning the Word, and concerning the procession of the divine persons: Basnage ⁱ and ^k Beausobre speak to the like purpose. And ^l Methodius is one of those many ancient writers, whom Huet supposeth to have thought falsely and absurdly about the trinity, and yet are not reckoned heretics, but are counted amongst the orthodox writers of the church.

Let me take a passage or two of our author, that the reader may the better judge for himself. In the work Concerning the Creatures, he says: ‘There ^m are two creative powers: one, who by his pure will, without any difficulty, creates what he pleaseth out of nothing; this is the Father: the other disposeth into order, and polisheth things already made, in imitation of the former; [or, according to the model given by the former;] this is the Son, the all-powerful and strong hand of the Father, by which he adorns and finishes the matter first made by him out of nothing.’

79. A. B. ap. Combef. *Auct. Noviss.*

^d Non videntur hæc sane dicta. Possinii explicatio pia est, sed violenta. Plane enim distinguit Methodius primum Adamum et secundum, vultque utrumque ipsum reipsa Christum extitisse, incessenter Verbo ac il-
labente, &c. Combef. *Annot. ib.* 146. B.

^e Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 13, n. ix. x. p. 147, &c. ^f Grabe in *Annotatis*, ib. p. 150.

^g Du Pin, as before, p. 198.

^h Tillem. as above, p. 138. ⁱ Dissimulari tamen vix potest, multa in Methodio reperiri durissima, quæque Ariana vestigia non obscure exhibeant, &c. Basnage. *Ann.* 100, n. ix. Vid. quæ ibidem sequuntur, et num. vii.

^k Hist. de Manichæe, &c. l. vi. ch. iii. n. vii. T. ii. p. 377, note 7.

^l Nam ut alios bre-

vitatis causa prætermittam, quot recensere possumus, nulla hæreseos suspicione aspersos, et de trinitate tamen falsa et absurda commentos? Venient in hunc ordinem Justinus Martyr, — Clemens Romanus, — Methodius, — Huet. *Origen.* l. ii. c. 3, n. vi.

^m Οτι φησιν ο αγιος, δυο δε δυναμεις εν τοις προωμολογημασις ιφαι-
μεν ιησαι ποιητικας. την εξ ης ονταν γημι-
την βουληματι, χωρις μεισμου, [αλ. μειλσμου,]
μια τη διλσσαι αυτηγενσας ο βουλειται επι-
μειν τυχαιαι δε ο πατηρ. Γατιται δι κα-
τακτισμους και ανακιλλουσας κατα μωσιν
της προτερας τα ηδη γεγονοτα. εστι δε ο υιος
η παντοδυναμος και κραταια χειρ του πατρος,
ενηματα το ποιησαι της υλης εξ ης ονταν ην
τακτισμει. *Method. de creat. ap. Phot. Cod.*
235, p. 937, fin. et ap. Combef. p. 344

This

This passage is censured by ^a Petavius. I see that ^o bishop Bull endeavours to justify it: but ^p Beaufobre says that this passage 'favours of Platonism, according to which it was thought 'improper that ^q the supreme God should meddle with matter, 'or make any thing that is perishable.' He says, moreover, that some of the ancient fathers 'divided the creation between 'the Father and the Son. The celebrated Methodius supposed 'that the Father's part lay in bringing matter out of nothing, 'and that of the Son in forming the world after the plan which 'the Father had shewn him.'

Let us in the next place take the sequel of the passage above transcribed, relating to the first man: 'For,' says ^r Methodius, 'that is Christ, even man filled with pure and perfect deity, and 'God contained in man: for it was highly becoming that the 'most ancient of æons, and the chief of archangels, since he was 'to live with men, should inhabit the most ancient and first of 'men, that is, Adam.'

These last words of our author Basnage ^s is much offended with: the most ancient of æons he thinks more becoming the mouth of a Valentinian than a catholic Christian. Grabe ^t thought proper to allege the first part of this passage as a proof that Methodius believed Christ's true deity: but then he omitted the latter part of the passage, being, I suppose, too much in haste to transcribe it all: nevertheless, if the latter part of the passage should be understood to be explanatory of the former part of it (as possibly it may), then Grabe's argument would be of little weight.

I shall transcribe no more passages relating to this matter, but only refer to some places ^u in the margin, to be consulted by those who are curious, and have leisure; and particularly to ^v Beaufobre's remarks upon the forecited passages of Methodius: nor do I venture to say what was this writer's real opinion concerning the trinity; for this appears to me a point not easily decided: and I think it would require a nice and careful disquisi-

^a Petav. de Trinit. l. i. c. iv. n. xii. ap. Dogm. Theol. Tom. ii.

^o Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 13, n. x.

^p Beaufobre, as before, l. vi. ch. 6.

^q n. ii. T. ii. p. 360. ^r — dans le-

quel on ne permettoit pas au Dieu suprême de mettre la main à l'œuvre, de toucher à la matière, ni de former rien de périssable.

^s Ibid. ^t Τετο γαρ ειναι του Χριστου, ανθρωπον

κρητου διοτι ητι και τελευτα συμπληρωμενοι, και

δυναν ανθρωπων κειχωρημενοι. ην γαρ περιω-

δωτατος, του πρωτου των αιωνων και

ειναι των αρχαγγελων, ανθρωπος μελλοντα

συννομιαν, εις τον πρωτου των ανθρωπων εισοικισθηται, του Αδαμ. Conviv. p. 79. B.

^v Mirum sane Christi titulum, antiquissimum æonum et sola Valentini schola dignum. Basn. Ann. 300, n. vii. ^w Grab. Annot. ad Bull. Def.

Fid. Nic. p. 150. ^x Vid. Excerpt. ex

libr. de Creatis ap. Phot. Cod. 235, p. 940.

Conviv. Decem Virg. ap. Combef. Auct.

Nov. p. 75. C. p. 80. A. B. p. 81. C. D.

p. 82. B. C. 101. D. 113. D.

^y Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 118, 119.

tion to determine, upon good ground, what was his sentiment upon that head.

6. Methodius is likewise called a millenarian. Du Pin having made his extracts out of the Banquet says: 'I stay not to observe that he has taught in this treatise the opinion of the millenarians.' Tillemont² too says that Methodius here clearly admits the opinion of the millenarians, and a reign of the saints upon the earth for the space of a thousand years after the resurrection: and³ it must be owned that in the Banquet he expresseth himself after that manner: but in the Fragments of the discourse, Of the Resurrection, he affirms that the earth is not to be annihilated, but changed and renewed. 'Since therefore,' says^b he, 'the earth will exist still, doubtless it will have inhabitants, such as never die any more, nor marry, nor bring forth children, but are as the angels, unchangeable and uncorruptible, enjoying perpetual felicity.' This passage is somewhat difficult to be reconciled with that in the Banquet. Petavius understood^c our author to speak here of everlasting happiness upon this earth. And afterwards, in that discourse or dialogue Concerning the Resurrection, he says: 'So^d far we are to be like unto the angels, that as the angels in heaven, so also we in paradise, shall no more marry or feast, but shall be employed in seeing God, and in improving ourselves under the government and conduct of Christ: for he said not, they shall be angels, but *as the angels*.' Huet^e refers to these passages as a proof that Methodius himself, who proposed to correct Origen, did not always express himself justly concerning the resurrection.

7. According to Methodius, human souls^f are corporeal. This he argues from the parable of the rich man and Lazarus in Luke xvi. so far as in hell, the separate state of existence, they

¹ Du Pin, as before, p. 198.

² Tillem. as before, p. 138.

³ Con. p. 129. A. B. and see above, p. 305, noteⁿ.

^b ——— ἰσομενης γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τῶν τοῦ αἰῶνα γῆς, ἀναγκη πασα εἶσθαι καὶ οἰκησοντας, ἐκεῖ τὴν ἐξομενης, ἢ γαμήσοντας καὶ γινώσκουσιν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀγγέλους ἀμεταστροφῶς ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ τὰ ἀριστὰ πράσσοντας. ap. Epiph. H. 64. n. xxxii. p. 555. D.

^c Hic perspicue post iudicium homines terram habitaturos asserit: non ut Chiliastæ ad aliquot duntaxat sæcula, sic ut interim suprema illa felicitate, hoc est, aspectu Dei carerent: verum ut et perpetuo in hac terra degerent, et summa nihilominus illic ac perfecta beatitate fruerentur. Petav. animad. in Epiph. p. 261.

^d ——— ὡς ὡσπερ οἱ ἀγγέλοι ἐν τῇ

ἑρανῶ, ὥτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ παραδείσῳ, ὡς γὰρ οἱ ἡλιπιναι εἰσι σχολάζοντες, ἀλλὰ τὴν βλέπειν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ γινώσκειν τὴν ζῶν, πρὸς ταπεινότητος ἡμῶν τῇ Χριστῷ. ap. Epiph. Hier. 64. n. xxxv. p. 558. A.

^e Unde ne ipse quidem Origenis castigatōr Methodius sine cespitatione hoc argumentum tractavit, homines fingens post resurrectionem habitaturos in terra jam instaurata, et per acrem temperatissimum ambientem in melius mutata, et in paradisi deliciis beatum ævum acturos: angelis autem cælestes orbes destinatum esse domicilium. Huet. Orig. l. ii. c. 2, Qu. 9. n. vi. p. 132.

^f αἱ δὲ ψυχῆ ἀπο τῶν θνητῶν καὶ πατρῶν τῶν ὀλῶν, σώματα νοερά ὑπαρχούσαι, κ. λ. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 932.

p. 255.

are spoken of as having a tongue, a finger, and other members. He is also reckoned among those fathers who supposed angels to be corporeal.

8. I have one observation to make here upon occasion of the several errors imputed to Methodius: this good man, who not long after Origen's death bore hard upon him, calling him centaur, as if he had been a monster, partly heathen, partly Christian, is himself liable to the charge or suspicion of heresy, in those latter times of greater orthodoxy.

9. In^h one place of the Banquet are mentioned these following heretics all together: Sabellius, Artemas, and the Ebionites, Marcion, Valentinus, and the Helcesaites. What he says of them may be taken into consideration at some other time.

I shall put down no more passages of this sort from our author, but proceed to what remains.

V. I am now to observe this writer's testimony to the books of the New Testament.

Methodius says expressly, 'Thereⁱ have been four gospels delivered to us:' I need not therefore put down particular quotations of each gospel: indeed he has not mentioned the writers by name: however, no one can make any doubt or question but he meant our gospels, and ascribed them to the same evangelists that we, and all Christians in general, have always done.

VI. He speaks of the baptism of Paul by Ananias, and particularly refers to the history of it^k in the Acts.

VII. It cannot be needful that I should transcribe particular passages of all the epistles of St. Paul cited by this author. It may suffice to observe, that he has quoted or alluded to these following epistles of that apostle; the epistle to the Romans, the first and second to the Corinthians, the epistles to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the first to the Thessalonians, and the first to Timothy: words of most of these are cited more than once, either as the apostle's or as Paul's. I have observed no clear references to the^l second to the Thessalonians, the second to Timothy, or to Titus, or Philemon, in those extracts or treatises which I make use of as unquestionably

ⁱ Vid. Huet. Origen. l. ii. c. 2, Qu. 5. n. viii. p. 71.

^h Conv. p. 113. D.

ⁱ — δια τούτο καὶ εὐαγγέλια τέσσαρα παραδίδονται, τετρακὶς εὐαγγελισάμεν τε οὕτω τῇ αἰσχροπότητι, καὶ παιδαγωγώσαντος τέσσαρες ῥομοί, κ. λ. Conv. Dec. Virg. p. 131. B. Combef. Auct. Nov. P. i.

^k εὐαγγελίζομεν καὶ ἀνακαινίζομεν αὐτοὺς λίαν τῷ βαπτισματι, καθὼς ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν ἡστορία περιέχει. ib. p. 83. A.

^l Though I do not now recollect any clear indisputable references to the second epistle to the Thessalonians, in the remaining works of Methodius; yet I suppose him to refer to 2 Thess. i. 5: *that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God*, when he says of some ancient worthies, *τῆς βασιλείας καταξιωθέντες*. Conv. p. 105. A.

genuine:

genuine: nevertheless it cannot be doubted but he received all these epistles; as Origen and other Christians did about his time.

VIII. He seems to have several passages out of the epistle to the Hebrews. He says: 'We ^m restrain evil thoughts, lest any ^{root of bitterness} springing up should trouble us:' see Hebr. xii. 15. This is taken from the fragments of the treatise Of the Resurrection. In the Banquet he appears to allude to it several times. He says: 'The ⁿ law was not so beautiful as the gospel; for that ^{was a kind of type and shadow of things to come: this is the truth and the grace of life.} And a little before he had said: 'For ^o the law is the type and shadow of the image, that is, of the gospel; but the gospel is the image of the truth itself.' This is very agreeable to what is said Hebr. x. 1. *For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices make the comers thereunto perfect.* He says likewise: 'For ^p after the resurrection the truth shall be clearly manifested to us, when we shall see face to face, and not through a glass darkly and in part, the holy tabernacle, the city in the heavens, whose builder and maker is God:' here he joins together words of 1 Cor. xiii. 12, and Hebr. xi. 10, which last place is thus: *For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.* He speaks ^q of Jesus having passed into the heavens; the very same expressions which we have in Heb. iv. 14. Having made honourable mention of Seth, Enos, Enoch, Methuselah, and Noah, he adds: 'These ^r were the first lovers of righteousness, and the first of the first-born children, which are written in heaven:' see Hebr. xii. 23. These allusions, and these expressions, borrowed, as it seems, from the epistle to the Hebrews, afford a probable argument of his using it, and of his respect for it.

Let us now see whether Methodius has not ascribed this epistle to St. Paul: 'Since,' says ^s he, 'the law, according to the apostle, is spiritual, containing images of good things to come.' The first part of the observation seems to be taken from

^m οὐ μὲν ἰσταῖθα τὰς βλάσφας αὐτῆς, οἷον τὰς ἐνθυμικαίας τὰς ποικίλας, συγγελλομένης, μηδὲ μὴ πικρίας αἰὼν φῦσσαι ἐνοχλήσῃ. De Resurr. ap. Epiph. Har. 64, n. xxv. p. 548. D. ap. Combef. p. 286.

ⁿ — ο ἰσχυρὸς ἀλλ' οὐχ' ὅπως ἢν ἡρακλῆος ὡς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου· ἐκείνος γὰρ τυπὸς τῆς ἡθ' καὶ σκία τῶν μελλόντων πραγμάτων· τὸτο δὲ ἀληθεῖα καὶ ζωῆς χάρις. Conviv. p. 127. A. ap. Combef. Auct. Nov. ^o ο μὲν γὰρ ἰσχυρὸς τῆς ἐκείνου ἐστὶ τυπὸς καὶ σκία, τὸτο δὲ εὐαγγέλιον· τὸ δὲ ἰσχυρὸν, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας. Conviv. p. 125. C.

^p το γὰρ ἀληθὲς μὴ ἀναγκασί δὴλασται, ὅσοι προσηγορίαι κατὰ προσωποῦ, τὴν ἀγίαν σκηνὴν, τὴν πόλιν τῆς ἡθ' ἡρακλῆος καὶ ἐκδημιουργὸς Θεός, ἀλλ' οὐ δὲ αἰνυμάτων καὶ ἐκ μέρους ἐκπλήτισται. Conv. p. 96. C. ^q — τῷ διδασκάλῳ τῆς ἡθ' ἡρακλῆος. Conv. p. 129. A.

^r — πρῶτοι δικαιοσύνης γὰρ ἡθ' ἡρακλῆος καὶ πρῶτοι πρῶτοτόκων τῶν ἀπογεγενημένων ἐν ἡθ' ἡρακλῆος. Conv. p. 105. A.

^s Εἰς ἰσχυρὸς ἐστὶ, κατὰ τὸν ἀποστόλου, τὰς ἐκείνου ἐμπειριῶν τῶν μελλόντων. ib. p. 96. A. B.

p. 260.

Rom. vii. 14, where it is said, that *the law is spiritual*; and the second from Hebr. x. 1. Indeed the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews there says, that *the law had not the very image of the things*: whereas Methodius here speaks of the law containing images of good things: but he useth the word image loosely: he means no more than what he had expressed in the words before cited from him, that *the law was a type and shadow* of things to come, and as such contained, or obscurely hinted and represented, the images of them. That he intends not to say any thing more in this place, than in the former, is evident from several things that follow here; to which the reader is referred, if he has any doubt: in particular he says presently afterwards, 'that the Jews had only a shadow of the image, at the third remove from the truth.'

Lastly, there is in the Banquet an exhortation to steadfastness in virtue, notwithstanding the greatest opposition from the enemy. 'For ye will obtain unspeakable renown, if ye shall overcome, and seize the seven crowns, for the sake of which the race and combat is set before us, according to the master Paul.' There may be in this passage, and in what precedes, a reference to the twelfth, and some other verses of the sixth, chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians: but the latter part of the passage, *the race set before us*, seems to be taken from Hebr. xii. 1; and for that it is more particularly that he alleges Paul's authority.

By these several passages I am induced to think it probable, that Methodius received the epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's.

I formerly shewed the reasons why I do not esteem the homily concerning Simeon and Anna to be genuine. I am therefore far from alleging any thing out of it as a proof of the sentiments of our Methodius: but if that piece had been genuine, I suppose it might afford an undeniable testimony to this epistle; for there it is said, that 'God took on him [or laid hold of] the seed of Abraham, according to the most divine Paul, and through him of the whole human kind:' see Hebr. ii. 16.

IX. There is very little notice taken of the seven catholic epistles in the remaining pieces of this writer.

1. He speaks of Christ as the *chief shepherd*: perhaps he borrows that character from 1 Pet. v. 4.

¹ Ἄλλα Ἰσραῖλοι μὲν τὴν σκίαν τῆς εἰκόνος, τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας, κατηγγέλκασιν· καὶ ἡ. ib. p. 96. C. ² Μυρίον γὰρ ἐξίτι αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀφελῆτε ἡκιστάς τῆς ἐπ' αὐτῶν σκάνης ἐπὶ, δι' ἧς ἀγαθὴ καὶ προσκίται καὶ τῶν, κατὰ τοὺς διδασκαλοὺς Παύλου. ib. p.

116. B.

² — ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ ἐπιλαβόμενος κατὰ τὸν Διδοτάου Παύλου, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν πάντος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύλου. De Sim. et A. p. 427. D. Combefis. Ὑ ἀρχιποιμῆν. CORV. p. 70. C.

2. In the place referred to a little while ago Methodius says of the Ebionites, that ‘^a they assert the prophets spoke of their own motion.’ Possibly our author has here an eye to 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. *Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is ^a of any private interpretation: for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God ^b spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* He says: ‘The ^c Jews look for a sensible [or ‘earthly] kingdom, and place their hopes in this strange land, ^d which the divine word says shall pass away.’ In 2 Pet. iii. 10. it is said *the heavens shall pass away ^d with a great noise*: perhaps Methodius refers to this text, perhaps to some others. In another place he says, ‘the ^e whole world shall be consumed [or ‘overflowed] with fire;’ though according to his opinion it will not then utterly perish, but will be renewed and restored: possibly Methodius here refers to 2 Pet. iii. 6, 7, where it is said: *the world that then was, being ^f overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth which are now,—are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment.*

3. He observes, that ‘^g the world lieth in wickedness:’ the same thing that is said in the same words in 1 John v. 20.

4. I transcribe nothing more here relating to these epistles. Undoubtedly Methodius received the first epistle of Peter, and the first epistle of John; for they were admitted as genuine, without controversy, by all catholic Christians. But what was our author’s opinion concerning the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the epistle of Jude, does not clearly appear from his remaining works.

X. The Revelation is very often quoted by Methodius as the writing of John: ‘And ^h that the Word who became man is the chief virgin, [or prince of virgins,] as well as the chief shepherd, and chief prophet of the church, John, inspired by Christ, has shewn us in the book of the Revelation: *And I looked, and lo, a lamb stood on the mount Sion.—These are they which are not defiled with women, for they are virgins: these are they which follow the lamb whithersoever he goes:*’ Rev. xiv. 1—4. This passage

^a — ως εβιοναιοι, εξ ιδίας κινήσεως της προφητας λαλῶντες. Φιλονικητες. Conv. p. 113. D. ^a ιδίας επιθυσιως η γινεται.

^b ἀλλ’ ὑπο πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλουν οἱ ἅγιοι διὰ ἀνθρώπων.

^c βασιλείαν αἰσθητὴν προσδοκῶντες, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ταύτης της αλλοτρίας, ἢ παρελιυσθῆναι λόγος, τιθεμένοι τὰς ἐλπίδας. Conv. p. 90. A.

^d ἐν ἣ οἱ ἔρανοι ριζήδων παρελύσσονται. ^e ἀπὰς ὁ κόσμος κατακαύζομενος πυρὶ. ap. Epiph. Hær. 64. n.

xxx. p. 553. D.

^f — ὁρατὶ ἐκταλυσθῆναι. ^g τῶν τοῦ κόσμου ἐν τῇ σιμῇ κεισθῆναι. De Resur. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 321, et ap. Combef. Bibl. p. 522. B.

^h Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀρχιπατριάρχης, οὐ τρεῖς καὶ ἀρχιεπίσκοποι καὶ ἀρχιεπίσκοποι γίνονται λόγος ἐνανθρωπήσας, της ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἡ χριστοληπτος ἡμῶν παριστάνει ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννης, λέγων· Καὶ ἰδοὺ καὶ. Conv. p. 70. C. D.

p. 265.

is in the Banquet; and in the same work: 'As ⁱ also John shews, saying, that the incense in the vials of the four and twenty elders are the prayers of saints:' see Rev. v. 8. Again, 'John ^k relating the revelation says: And there appeared a great wonder in heaven, and what follows: where Methodius quotes Rev. xii. 1—6. In the same work the ^l Revelation is quoted as scripture, and a book of authority. In the extracts out of the treatise of the Resurrection, made by Photius, he quotes this book as written ^m by the blessed John. In the same extracts are these words: 'How ⁿ then is Christ celebrated by the prophets and the apostles as the first-begotten of the dead?' This is often said of Christ in the New Testament, as Acts xxvi. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 20; and twice almost in the very expression of Methodius, Col. i. 18, and Rev. i. 5. If we could be certain that Methodius referred to this place in the Revelation, then we should be assured that he supposed the writer of this book to be the apostle John. Finally, Methodius is mentioned by ^o Andrew of Cæsarea with Irenæus and others, who had bore testimony to the divine inspiration of this book. I think it is plain from what has been here collected, that Methodius received the Revelation as a book of authority; and very probable that he esteemed it a writing of John the apostle and evangelist.

XI. His forms of quotation, or general terms made use of in speaking of these books, and marks of respect for them, are such as these; ^p scriptures, ^q holy, or sacred scriptures, ^r divine scriptures. He speaks of ^s the Old Testament, which implies an acknowledgment of another that is new; both which are indeed quoted very largely by him, and as books of authority. In a passage quoted some while ago he speaks of prophets and apostles, thereby expressing the two general divisions of the scriptures before and after the coming of Christ: he ^t quotes these books by way of proof of what he says. He ^u affirms, that 'there is no contradiction or absurdity in the divine words.' The gospels are cited by him after this manner: 'The ^x Lord declares

ⁱ καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐμνήστε, κ. λ. ib. p. 97. A. ^k — τῆς ἀποκαλύψιν ο Ἰωάννης ἐξηγήμενος λέγει. ib. p. 109. D.

^l — γίνεται κατὰ τὴν τῆς γραφῆς, ὅπου τ μὲν ἀποκαλύψιν ἀρτεῖα τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδρῆται γενναί. ib. p. 111. C.

^m ο μακάριος Ἰωάννης. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 924, ap. Combes. p. 326. B.

ⁿ πως δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς πρωτοτοκος εἶναι τῶν ἁγίων ὑπο τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ῥηταί; ap. Phot. ib. p. 925, et ap. Combes. p. 328. ^o Vid. Andr. Prolog.

in Apoc. p. 3. B. C. ^p Vid. Method. Conv. p. 125. A. et passim. ^q ταῖς

ἁγίαις γραφαῖς. ib. p. 66. D. ^r αἱ

θεῖαι γραφαί. p. 89. A. ^s ἐκ παλαιᾶς ἡμῖν κατὰ παρρησίαν διαθήκης ἐγγράφων προφητεῖαν. ib. p. 130. C. ^t οὗτοι γὰρ

ἁμαρτωροὶ ο ἱ λόγοι γραφῶν. ap. Epiph. p. 548. D. Vid. ib. n. xvii. p. 539. C.

^u ὅτι μηδὲν ὑπεναντιώσκει ἡ ἀποπία ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς λόγοις. ap. Epiph. ib. Hæc. 64, p. 555. B. ^x καὶ ὁ κυριος — ἡ

εὐαγγελιστὴς παρρησίαν. Conv. p. 66. D.

' in

'in the gospels.' Again: 'As^a also our Lord Jesus Christ directs and commands in the gospels: *Let your lights shine, and your loins be girded about, and be ye yourselves like men that wait for their lord:*' Luke xii. 35—38. 'For^a ye are the salt of the earth, said the Lord to the apostles:' see Matt. v. 13. 'Where,^a according to the true oracles of the Lord, they neither marry nor are given in marriage:' see Matth. xxii. 30. He quotes St. Paul after this manner: says^b the blessed Paul; 'the most wise Paul;'^d Paul, a wise man, and most spiritual, or full of the Holy Ghost. He^c recommends the study and meditation of the scriptures.

XII. In the remains of Methodius there are many interpretations of texts of scripture; but, in my opinion, for the most part, such as do little honour to the author's judgment: I shall put down two or three, which are somewhat remarkable.

1. He understands^f the words of Christ in John v. 39, to be a command to *search the scriptures*; not a declaration what was then the practice of the Jews: accordingly, he makes use of this text as an argument to search even the most abstruse and difficult parts of scripture, and as an encouragement to explain them so far as we are able.

2. St. Paul writes: *I knew a man in Christ, — such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, — how that he was caught up into paradise:* 2 Cor. xii. 2—4. Methodius^g is clearly of opinion that the apostle here speaks of two remarkable revelations, and two different raptures, one into the third heaven, the other into paradise: and he thinks that they who carefully attend to the expressions of the apostle will perceive, that he does not speak of paradise and the third heaven as one and the same place, or suppose paradise to be in the third heaven.

3. Theodoret has quoted this passage of Methodius out of his discourse Concerning Martyrs: 'For,' says^h he, 'martyrdom

Υ καθ' ον τροπον και ο κυριος ημων εν ευαγγελις Ιησους Χριστος, ωδε νομοθετων. Conv. p. 92. B. C.

^a υμεις γαρ εις το αλας της γης, ο κυριος εφη τοις αποστολεις. ib. p. 67. D.

^b ιδθα' οτι γαμνουν, οτι γαμνισκονται, κατα τας αψευδεις τη κυριω χρησμες. ib. p. 76. C.

^c — φησιν ο μακαριος Παυλος. Conv. p. 67. D.

^d χαβατιρ και ο σοφωτατος Παυλος δηλοι. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 924, f.

^e ως εκ αν' ο πνευματικωτατος και σοφος αινης, του Παυλου λεγω. Conv. p. 77. A.

^f πρωτον τον υρειον της ψιγης κτησασθαι καρπον. ιστα τα καλλυθρα, την ασκησιν και μιλιτη των γραφων. ib. p. 127. C.

^g περι δε τη την επιλυσιν αυτων ανιραστην και επισην, μειζον η καθ' ημας' ομας τελεματιον, ψιγευσασαν τη κειλευσαντι τας γραφας εριυναν. Conv. p. 110. A.

^h Οτι δε αποκαλυψεις φησι γιγονται τη αγιω Παυλω λεγει γαρ, αλλ' ωδε ο αποστολος υποτιθεται ηναι τον παραδεισον εν τη τριτω υρειω, της λεπλων ακροασθαι λογων επιγαμιους — δε αποκαλυψεις μεγαλας ευρακιναις μενην, δε αναλειφθεις εναργως. κ. λ. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 910. ap. Combef. Bib. p. 308.

ⁱ Ουτω γαρ θανυματοι και περισπωλατοι εις το μαρτυριον, οτι αυτος ο κυριος Ιησους Χριστος ο υιος της θεης, τιμω αυτο μαρτυρησιν, ως απεπαχητοι κτησαμινος το ιστα στα θεης

p. 270.

is so admirable and desirable that the Lord Jesus Christ himself, the Son of God, was pleased to be a martyr, not esteeming it a thing to be earnestly sought, to be like God, that he might bless man, to whom he had descended, with this gift also: see Philip. ii. 6. This is the entire passage as given us by Theodoret. Bishop Bull understood the expression of St. Paul here made use of in the sense of our English version, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*: and he refers to a place of Petavius, where he also is supposed to be of the same opinion. Nevertheless, it seems to me that, in this passage of Methodius, the expression can admit of no other meaning than that in the translation I have made, and that it must denote a voluntary humiliation of Jesus Christ. There is likewise a passage in the Banquet where Methodius refers to Philip. ii. 6, 7; I put it in the ^k margin: I suppose it does not weaken but confirm the interpretation I have given of the expression in the sixth verse; which sense, it is certain, appears frequently in the Christian writers of the third century.

4. St. Paul writes: *And the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive*: 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. By the dead, ¹Methodius understood our bodies: *we which are alive*, are our souls, which receive the dead, that is our bodies, out of the earth: then *we*, soul and body, are to be caught up together to meet the Lord. This may be allowed to be a difficult text: but I am apt to think that many will consider this paraphrase as an example of the wrong and injudicious interpretations of our author, which I spoke of formerly; nor do I intend to add any more.

XIII. We perceive from the remains of Methodius that he received the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, St. Paul's epistles, and the epistle to the Hebrews as one of them. We have no plain evidence how many of the seven catholic epistles he received: undoubtedly he owned the first of St. Peter and the first of St. John, there never having been any doubt concerning the genuineness of these. His opinion about the rest we are not acquainted with. He likewise quotes the Revelation frequently as a book of sacred scripture, written by John; whom it is likely

καὶ τὴν τὴν ἀνθρώπων τὴν χάρισμα, εἰς
κατέστη, ὡς φησὶ. ap. Theodoret. Dial. i.
Tom. iv p. 37. ¹In libro de Martyri-
bus apud Theodoretum Christum nominat
Dominum et Filium Dei, qui non rapinam
arbitratus est, esse æqualem Deo. Quæ,
Petavio etiam iudice, non nisi in Deum
verum cadere possunt Bull. Def. Fid. Nic.
Sect. ii. c. 13, n. 9. Vid. Petav. Præfat.
in Tom. ii. c. 47 n. 5. ^kΔιο καὶ ἀνα-
φύκει εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνιήσκει τὸ ὄψον, ἀπὸ τοῦ

πνεύματος τῆς θεότητος εἰς τὸν βίον ἐλευ-
θετός. Κενώθηκε γὰρ καὶ τὴν μορφὴν τοῦ θεοῦ
προσλαβών, εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τέλειότητα παλὴν
ἀντιληρωθῆ. κ. λ. Cony. p. 115. A. B.

¹— τὴν ἐστὶν, αὐτὰ ἡμεῖς ταῦτα τὰ
σώματα· ἡμεῖς γὰρ οἱ ζῶντες, αἱ ψυχὰι ἡ-
μεῖς. οἱ ἀπολαμβάνοντες ἐγερθέντες [αἱ ἐγερ-
θέντες] ἐκ τῆς γῆς νεκρῶν κ. λ. ap. Phot.
Cod. 234, p. 924, in. et ap. Combef. p.
325.

he supposed to be John the apostle and evangelist. We have seen in him clear proofs that the scriptures of the New Testament, generally received by Christians, were well known, much used, and highly esteemed: being books of authority, and appealed to in all points of dispute and controversy. I have not observed in this Greek writer, of the third century, any quotations of Christian apocryphal writings: nor do the works of this author afford any the least ground to suppose that there were any writings of ancient Christian authors that were esteemed sacred and of authority, beside those which are now generally received as such by us; namely, the writings of apostles and evangelists.

C H A P. LVIII.

LUCIAN, presbyter of Antioch; and HESYCHIUS, bishop in Egypt.

I. *Lucian, his history, and testimonies to him.* II. *His edition of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament.* III. *Hesychius, his history, and his edition of the Old and New Testament.* IV. *Lucian's works.* V. *His sentiment upon the doctrine of the trinity.* VI. *Concluding remarks.*

I. SAYS ^a Jerom in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers: 'Lucian, a most eloquent man, presbyter of the church of Antioch, was so laborious in the study of the scriptures, that to this day some copies of the scriptures are called Lucian's. There are extant some discourses [or small treatises] of his concerning the faith, and some short epistles to several. He suffered at Nicomedia for confessing the name of Christ, in the reign of Maximin, and was buried at Helenopolis in Bithynia.'

Cave says that ^b Lucian was contemporary with Paul of Samosata, and flourished chiefly about the year 290. He suffered

^a Lucianus, vir disertissimus, Antiochenæ ecclesiæ presbyter, tantum in scripturarum studio laboravit, ut usque nunc quædam exemplaria scripturarum Lucianea nuncupentur. Feruntur ejus de Fide libelli, et breves ad nonnullos epistolæ. Passus est Nicomediæ ob confes-

sionem Christi sub persecutione Maximini sepultusque est Helenopoli Bithyniæ. Hier de V. I. cap. 77. ^b Noster hic Paul Samosatæus erat ætate suppar, præcipue vero claruit circa an. 290. Cav. Hist. L in Luciano.

p. 275.

martyrdom in ^c 311, or rather ^d in 312, and on the seventh day of January in that year.

It is now commonly said by ^e learned moderns, that (A) Lucian was born at Samosata: but it is said, I think, upon the credit only of ^f the Acts of Lucian, and ^g of Suidas, who ^h copied those Acts; which is no authority at all. Tillemont himself says, that ⁱ 'those Acts are certainly a work of Metaphrastes, and that they are mixed with fables, and have divers faults contrary to the truth of history; which,' says he, 'may excuse our not paying any regard to them, when they differ from other authors; and allows us to take little notice of them in other points.' Bollandus likewise observes upon those Acts, that ^k the Menologium makes Lucian a native of Antioch.

It seems to me that the author of the Acts, who had little regard to truth, and was not much concerned to be rightly informed, confounds upon this occasion Lucian, presbyter of Antioch, with Lucian the famous heathen dialogist, who lived in the second century, and was of Samosata.

This may be thought a trifle not worth taking notice of: but really it gives one offence to see learned men deliver for history what has no good authority, and supply their accounts of this eminent person out of a piece which is good for nothing: nor is this particular altogether trifling; for when those learned writers come to consider a difficult question, concerning Lucian's opinion about the doctrine of the trinity, this circumstance of Lucian's being a native of the same city with Paul, bishop of Antioch, is almost always ^l taken in as a thing of some moment.

I must add that it is to the honour of Theodoric Ruinart, that

^c Baron. Ann. 311. n. iii. iv. Fabric.

ib. Gr. T. v. p. 279. ^d Ruin. Act.

Mart. p. 504. Pagi Ann. 311, n. x. et xx.

Bainag. 312, n. iv. Tillem. S. Lucien.

Mem. T. v. P. iii. p. 150, 151, et note v.

^e Lucianus, nobili profapia ortus, patriam habuit Samosata, urbem Syriae non

incelebrem, ejusdem et urbis et nominis

cum famoso illo Christianae religionis deri-

toris, qui Traiani tempore vixit. Cav. ubi

supr. Conf. Bafin. an. 312, n. 23. Tillem.

ib. supr. p. 146, et passim. (A) In the

preceding note I have placed Tillemont

among those who say Lucian was born at

Samosata: for such are his words: Il na-

quit à Samosates dans la Syrie appelée

Euphratesienne. ubi supr. p. 146. And

yet he was aware that this is destitute of

foundation; as appears from what he says

in another place. Il estoit, à ce qu' on

perçoit, de même pays que Paul de Sa-

mosates. ib. p. 398, not. 1, sur S. Lucien.

^f Vid. Bolland. Act. Sanctior. T. i. p.

359, ^g Vid. Suid. V. ΛΗΚΙΔΙΟΥ. et Ho-

dinus de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. iv. c. iii. p.

626, et l. iii. P. i. c. 5. p. 303.

^h Vid. Kuster. ad Suid. ib. not. 5.

ⁱ See Mem. Ec. T. v. P. iii. p. 345,

346. ^k Menologium habet ex Antiochia

Syriae ortum fuisse Lucianum. Act. Sanct.

ib. p. 359. ^l Illum autem familiarem

fuisse Pauli Samosatensis, credibile est. Fuit

enim ipse oriundus ex urbe Samosatensis,

ut legitur in ejus vita. Et cum Paulus ex

ea urbe ad Antiochensem episcopatum

evectus est, Lucianus quoque ecclesiae An-

tiochenaes presbyter fuit. Pagi Ann. 311, n.

xii. Conf. Vales. Annot. in Thdr. H. E.

l. i. c. iv. Ex urbe Pauli erat heretici;

a Paulo ad presbyteratum in nobilissima

ecclesia Antiochena promotus fuerat: cu-

jus et errorem cum imbibisset, &c. Baf-

nag. Ann. 312, n. 13.

he has not inserted those Acts in his collection of Genuine and Select Acts of Martyrs: nor do I observe that in his account of Lucian he has borrowed any one article from them.

Of this person, in his Ecclesiastical History, Eusebius writes after this manner, speaking of those who suffered in the persecution begun by Dioclesian: ‘Among the presidents of the churches in great cities, who suffered at that time, the first to be recorded in the monuments of the pious is Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, a witness of the kingdom of Christ, who was beheaded: and ^m of Antioch, Lucian, a presbyter of that church, a man of an unblemished character throughout his whole life; he also suffered at Nicomedia, where, in the presence of the emperor, he first apologized for the heavenly kingdom of Christ in words, and afterwards farther recommended it by deeds.’

Again, in another place, the same ecclesiastical historian, having related the death of Peter of Alexandria by order of Maximinus, adds: ‘And with him suffered many other bishops of Egypt in like manner; as did also ⁿ Lucian, presbyter of the church of Antioch, an excellent man in all respects, celebrated for his piety and his knowledge of the scriptures: he was carried from Antioch to Nicomedia, where the emperor then was; and, having made an apology before the governor for the doctrine he professed, he was sent to prison, and there put to death.’

At this place Rufinus, in his Latin translation of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, makes a little alteration; and also inserts a speech of considerable length, said to be ^o the same apology which Lucian made to the Roman governor. Whereupon, as ^p Rufinus says, ‘the audience being much moved, and almost persuaded, Lucian was commanded away to prison, there to be put to death, as if they feared a tumult of the people.’ Of this apology I intend to take some farther notice by and by.

There is still extant a panegyric ^q oration or homily of St. Chrysostom, pronounced on the seventh day of January 387, in

^m Τὸν δ' ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας μαρτυρῶν τὸν πάντα βίον ἀγίος πρεσβύτερος τῆς αὐτοῦ παρικίας Λουκιανὸς ἐν τῇ Νικομηδείᾳ καὶ αὐτὸς, βασιλεὺς ἐπιπαρόντος, τὴν ἑραπὴν τῇ Χριστῷ βασιλείᾳ λόγῳ πρότερον δι' ἀπολογίας, εἶτα δὲ καὶ ἔργῳ ἀνακηρύξας. Euf. H. E. l. viii. c. xiii. in.

ⁿ Λουκιανὸς τὸ ἀντ' τα πάντα ἀγίος, βίῳ τε ἁγίᾳ, καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς μαθήμασι συγκειρομένης, τῆς κατ' Ἀντιοχείαν παρικίας πρεσβύτερος, ἀχθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς Νικομηδείας πό-

λεως, εὐδατηνηκασα βασιλεὺς διατρέχων ἐπὶ χαν, παρασχὼν τε ἐπὶ τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς ἐκείνης πρῶτατο διδασκαλίας ἀπολογίαν, διαμαρτυρῶν παραδόξῳ κτηνῶν. ib. l. ix. c. vi.

^o Tum ille, data sibi facultate dicendi, hujusmodi orationem de fide nostra habuisse dicitur. Rufin. H. E. l. ix. c. vi.

^p Et cum pene jam his verbis auditoribus suadere cōpisset, arripi jubetur in carcerem, ibique quasi absque tumultu populi necari. ib. ^q T. ii. p. 524—529.

honour of this martyr: but it is so oratorical, that though St. Chrysostom enlargeth upon the sufferings and fortitude of Lucian, and upon the manner of his death, it is very difficult to say how he would have us to suppose that the martyrdom of this presbyter, one of his predecessors in the church of Antioch, was performed: whether ¹ by famine, or by torture, or ² by both; and whether in prison, or abroad.

Sozomen, having occasion to speak of Lucian, who, he says, suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia, gives him this great character, that ³ 'he was likewise on other accounts very eminent, and ⁴ in a signal manner skilful in the sacred scriptures.'

Honorius of Autun says, that ⁵ Lucian was first presbyter of Antioch, and afterwards bishop of Nicomedia: but this is not said by Eusebius, or Jerom; and therefore, probably, it is without foundation. The error may have arisen from the place of Lucian's martyrdom, or from the near mention made of Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History. Eusebius does not suppose Lucian to have been bishop of Nicomedia, nor to have had any office in that church; for he reckons Lucian among the martyrs of the church of Antioch.

Jerom assured us that Lucian was buried at Helenopolis in Bithynia; but why he was buried there does not certainly appear from any good authority. In his Chronicle, at the 21st year of Constantine's reign, Jerom says: 'Constantine ⁶ repairing Drepanum, a city in Bithynia, in honour of the martyr Lucian, who was there buried, called it Helenopolis from his mother.' The same ⁷ is in the Paschal Chronicle, with this addition, ⁸ that Constantine enacted that all the lands in view of the city should be exempted from tribute: which privilege, the author says, was enjoyed to his time. Philostorgius, the credulous Arian historian, says, that ⁹ the empress Helena's fondness for that city was owing to this only, that the body of Lucian was brought thither after his martyrdom by a dolphin.

¹ Vid. Tillem. sur S. Lucien, notes 6 et 7. Il y a bien de difficulté pour le genre de la mort de S. Lucien. Id. ib. p. 410.

² Martyrium vero S. Luciani presbyteri Antiocheni, qui fame et cruciatibus multis, ut ait Chrysostomus, Christi nomen gloriose confessus est, accidit anno 311, vel 312. Monitum ad Hom. in S. Lucian. p. 523.

³ — Ληκκίαν, τὴν ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ μαρτυροῦσαν; ἀνδρὸς τὰ τε ἀλλὰ ἐνδοκίματον, καὶ τὰς ἱεράς γραφὰς εἰς ἀκρὸν ἐρευνήτορας. Sozom. l. iii. c. v. p. 503, A.

⁴ Antiochenæ ecclesiæ presbyter, post-

modum Nicomediæ episcopus. Honor. de Scriptor. Ec. c. 78.

⁵ Drepanum Bithyniæ civitatem in honorem martyris Luciani ibi conditi Constantinus instaurans ex vocabulo matris suæ Helenopolim nuncupavit. Hier. Chr. l. 2. p. 181. ⁶ — Chron. Pasc. p. 283.

⁷ — ἀπασθαι δὲ τὸ χωρίον κατ' ἄλλο μὲν ἔστιν, ὅτι δὲ Ληκκίαν ὁ μαρτυρὸς ἐκείνῃ τυχὼν μετὰ τὸν μαρτυρικὸν θάνατον ὑπὸ δελφίνῳ ἐκκομισθῆς. Philost. l. ii. c. xii. p. 474.

In a church of this city, which was near Nicomedia, Constantine, a little before his death, prepared himself for ^a baptism.

Jerom has not only allotted Lucian a place in his book of Illustrious men, and mentioned him in his Chronicle, as already seen, but has likewise named him in his ^b letter to Magnus, among other Christian writers, eminent for polite learning, as well as for knowledge in the divine scriptures. And there are some other passages of his to be taken notice of.

II. Jerom said, in the place before cited from his Catalogue, that some copies of scripture were called Lucian's: he elsewhere ^c speaks of that matter more largely, where he says, that 'the churches of Egypt made use of that edition of the Septuagint, which was put out by Hesychius. From Constantinople to Antioch Lucian's edition was used; but the countries lying in the midst read the version of the Seventy, as published by Pamphilus and Eusebius from Origen's copy.'

There is another passage of Jerom concerning Lucian's edition of the Seventy, which ^d I transcribe at the bottom of the page.

And in his preface to the four gospels he ^e speaks of an edition of the New, as well as of the Old, Testament, made by Lucian and Hesychius; but he does not commend their copies; for, as he says, they were interpolated; that is, there were some things inserted in them without good authority, they being wanting in more ancient copies.

Jerom is now commonly understood to say in the first of these passages, that Lucian's edition of the version of the Seventy was generally used by the churches from Constantinople to Antioch, and Hesychius's by the churches in Egypt; but ^f Martianay denies

^a Vid. Euseb. de Vit. Const. l. iv. c. 61. p. 557.

^b —nec non presbyterorum Pamphili, Pierii, Malchionis, &c. Ep. 83. p. 656.

^c Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt. Totusque orbis ac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat. Hier. Praef. in Paralip. Opp. T. i. p. 1023. Eadem repetuntur in libr. ii. adv. Ruf. T. iv. p. 425.

^d In quo illud breviter admoneo, ut sciatis aliam esse editionem, quam Origenes, et Caesariensis Eusebius, omnesque Graeciae tractatores *Koinē*, id est, Com-

munem appellant, atque vulgatam, et a plerisque *Λευκαίος* dicitur; aliam Septuaginta Interpretum, quae in *Εἰσαγωγή* codicibus reperitur, et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est, et Hierosolymae atque in Orientis ecclesiis decantatur. Ep. ad Sun. et Fret. [al. Ep. 135] T. ii. p. 627.

^e Praetermitto codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa consuetudo: quibus utique nec in Veteri Testamento post Septuaginta Interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in Novo profuit emendasse: quum multarum gentium linguis scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt. Praef. in Quat. Evang.

^f Hunc locum male intelligunt, qui putant in omnibus Christi ecclesiis ita usurpatas fuisse editiones Graecas LXX. interpretum,

nies this. He says that the editions made by Lucian and Hesychius were used in those countries by a few only, and those men of mistaken judgment; and that the edition made from Origen's Hexapla generally prevailed every where: and it must be owned, that in the last cited passage Jerom not only censures the interpolations of those two critics in the New Testament, but likewise their emendations of the Old: and, in the passage which I have put in the margin, he depreciates Lucian's edition of the Seventy, in comparison of Origen's, which last he himself followed in his translation of the Old Testament from the Greek.

Humphrey Hody doubted whether ^s Lucian and Hesychius had ever seen Origen's edition of the version of the Seventy: nor indeed have we any certain information upon that head, very little being said of their editions in the remaining pieces of ancient authors: but as Origen's performance was much celebrated, and his Tetrapla and Hexapla had been formed a good while before Lucian and Hesychius undertook any thing of that kind, it may be thought probable that those learned men were acquainted with Origen's Seventy; though perhaps they had not seen that correct edition which was published by Pamphilus and Eusebius.

The author of the *Synopsis Scripturæ Sacræ*, or of an addition to it, calls ^h the seventh and last Greek version of the Old Testament Lucian's; and says that his version was made from the Hebrew; and was found in the time of Constantine the Great at Nicomedia, privately hid in the hands of some Jews: which is in the main agreeable to what ⁱ is said in the Acts of Metaphraſtes, before censured: but this account is all false and mistaken. The seventh Greek version, as it is called, was in Origen's Hexapla, and was of a part only of the Old Testament: whereas Lucian's edition contained the whole Old Testament,

pretum, ut in Alexandrinorum et Ægyptiorum conventibus publice populo Christiano legerentur sacri codices juxta emendationem Hesychii; in ecclesiis autem Constantinopolitanis usque ad Antiochiam, juxta Luciani martyris recognitionem. Contrarium docet Hieronymus multis in locis: ac primum in præfatione in quatuor evangelia ad Damasum expresse testatur, has editiones paucis acceptas esse: Prætermitto eos codices, &c. Vides igitur, lector, intra provincias jam dictas a paucis, qui etiam perverse contenderent, fuisse suscepta Hesychii et Luciani exemplaria Scripturarum. Non idem sententiam de codicibus elaboratis ad Origenem.

— Illa namque editio celebris adeo fuit apud omnes, ut publice usurparetur in cunctis Christianorum ecclesiis, &c. Martian. Annot. ad Præf. Hieron. in Paralip. T. i. p. 1023. ^s Et dubito quidem ego, utrum Lucianus et Hesychius editionem Origenianam unquam oculis usurpârint, necne: quandoquidem eam a Pamphilo primum et Eusebio in lucem fuisse emissam verisimilius videtur. Hod. de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. iv. c. iii. p. 628.

^h Εὐδομη παλιν καὶ τὴν ὑποκρινόμεν ἡ τὴν ἀγίαν Λευκίαν — κ. λ. Syn. S. S. ap. Athan. T. ii. p. 205. ⁱ Vid. Hod. p. 626, 627.

as has been observed by ^k Hody, and ^l Montfauçon, men well skilled in this matter: nor is there any good reason to think that Lucian understood Hebrew: and the finding the copy among the Jews at Nicomedia appears to be altogether fabulous, or mistaken; for it is likely that ⁿ Lucian took care to publish copies of his work without delay. Yea the author of the Synopsis himself says, that ^o Lucian having finished his exact version delivered it to his Christian brethren; and yet he presently afterwards adds, that after his martyrdom it was ^p found in the hands of some Jews, where it had been lodged for safety; which, in my opinion, has not the appearance of probability: for the Jews of those times were always enemies to the Christians, and no more to be confided in than heathens, especially in times of persecution,

The late Jeremiah Jones thought that ^q the editions of the New Testament made by Lucian and Hesychius, and mentioned by Jerom, as above, are ^r the apocryphal gospels of Lucian and Hesychius, which are censured in the decree of Pope Gelasius; and that Gelasius means not any distinct gospels, but their interpolated editions of our canonical gospels. Hody ^s and Mill ^t speak to the like purpose.

III. As Hesychius has been now named, and I see no need to allot him a distinct chapter, I shall here observe that ^u he is generally supposed to be the same Hesychius, whom ^x Eusebius mentions with other bishops in Egypt, who obtained the crown of martyrdom in Dioclesian's persecution; but the time is not

^k Ut errant hi scriptores, cum editionem Luciani appellant translationem; sic rursus falluntur, cum Septimam dicunt: nescientis nimirum, exitisse Septimam quandam in Hexaplis Origenis. Hod. ib. p. 627.

^l Sic ille [auctor Synopsos,] decantatum illam Luciani martyris editionem cum Septima Hexapla confudit, exque duabus unam fecit. Quod commentum Eusebii atque Hieronymi testimoniis exploditur, quorum prior, Luciano martyri equalis, in ipso autographo vidit Septimam ab Origene ante annos plus quinquaginta in Hexaplis positam. Ad hæc vero auctoris Synopsos narratio respuitur ex ipsis Septimæ fragmentis, quæ, ut testificatur Eusebius et Hieronymus, in paucis scripturæ libris aderat: contra vero Luciani editio totam scripturam complectebatur, nihilque aliud erat quam interpretatio τῶν Ὁ plurimis in locis ab eodem sancto martyre emendata, quæ multis post consignata Hexapla annis prodierat. Hinc vero corrigendus Waltonus, qui ab auc-

tore Synopsos deceptus, opinatur Septimam eandem esse, quam Luciani martyris editionem. Proleg. ix. num. xx. Montf. Prelim. in Hex. Orig. cap. 8, §. ii. p. 58, 59. ^m See Tillem. St. Lucien. not. ii. p. 404, Mem. T. v. P. iii. ⁿ See Tillem. again, p. 405, who says, it is probable, that Lucian published many copies of his edition, and made it common.

^o καὶ διορθωσαμενος ἐν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐξεδото τοῖς χριστιανοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. Synops. ubi supr. p. 204, A. ^p — παρὰ Ἰουδαίους. — ib.

^q See his Canon of Scripture, vol. i. p. 281, 311. ^r Evangelia, quæ falsavit Lucianus, apocrypha. Evangelia, quæ falsavit Hesychius, apocrypha. Gelas. ap. Labb. T. iv. p. 1264.

^s Hod. ubi supr. p. 629. ^t Mill. Proleg. n. 728. ^u Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit.

Tillem. St. Pierre d'Alexandrie. Art. 10. Mem. T. v. P. iii. p. 124. et Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 279. ^x Φίλας τῆς καὶ

Ἡουχίος, καὶ Παχυμῖος, καὶ Θεόδωρος, τῶν ἀφ' ἧς τῆς Αἰγυπτίου ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας. Hist. Eccl. l. viii. cap. 13, p. 308, C.

exactly

p. 289.

exactly known. Cave says, that Hefychius flourished near the end of the third century, about the year 296, and placeth his martyrdom in 311; Balsage^y in 311 or 312. Tillemont speaks of him as suffering with others, whose martyrdom he placeth^z in 310.

It is observable that there is no distinct article for Hefychius in Jerom's Catalogue: nor is his name among other eminent Christian writers in Jerom's letter to Magnus.

Hody^a supposeth Jerom to refer to this person's edition of the Seventy in another place, beside those formerly taken notice of by me.

But it is not fit I should stay to enlarge farther on these matters: I therefore refer to Grabe, and others, who have published editions of the Seventy, or written prolegomena, or dissertations upon that version; and to Fabricius, who^b has a short article, with many good hints relating to the labours both of Lucian and Hefychius.

However, it should be here remembered, that Hefychius put out an edition of the New as well as of the Old Testament. The evidences of this we saw just now in^{*} Jerom.

IV. There is little if any thing of Lucian remaining.

1. In the Paschal Chronicle, the author, having shewn the fierceness of the persecution at Nicomedia, adds: 'Of^c this innumerable multitude of martyrs the presbyter Lucian writing to the Antiochians speaks in these words: "the whole choir of martyrs together salutes you. I take this opportunity to certify you, that Anthimus the bishop has finished the course of his martyrdom."

If this be genuine, we have here a part of one of those short epistles intended by St. Jerom. However, it is now the constant opinion of learned men that Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, suffered at the beginning of Dioclesian's persecution in 303, and that Lucian did not die before the year 311 or 312. If therefore this letter be his, he must have been at Nicomedia, and in communion with that church, and the martyrs there, when Anthimus suffered.

2. Eusebius assures us, that before Lucian suffered he apologized for the heavenly kingdom in words: and, as before shewn,

^y Basn. Ann. 312, n. 18.

Tillem. as referred to before, note^z.

^a Citatur alibi editio Hefychiana ab Hieronymo sub titulo Exemplarium Alexandrinorum. Hod. ib. p. 628, f. Conf. Hieron. in. l. f. lviii. 11, p. 433.

^b Vid. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 278, 279, Conf. eund. ib. T. ii. p. 358, 359.

^z See before, p. 326, note^c.

^c Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους τῶν μαρτυρησάντων Λυκανίου πρεσβυτέρου Ἀντιοχείου γραφῆς ἰδεῖν ἂν παύεται ὑμᾶς χορὸς ἀπᾶς ὡμῶν μαρτυρῶν. Συναγγελίζομαι δὲ ὑμᾶς, ὡς Ἀνθίμου οὐ παύσας τῶν τοῦ μαρτυρίου ὁρῶν ἐτελειώθη. Chr. Pasch. p. 277, C.

Rufinus

Rufinus has inserted a speech, as delivered by him; which I see ^d Huet quotes as Lucian's: and ^e Fabricius thinks it might be taken by Rufinus from the Acts of his martyrdom: but ^f Tillemont is of opinion that it is a speech of Rufinus's own making.

Whether it be Lucian's, or Rufinus's, or in part only the apology of our martyr, with some additions of the historian, I cannot forbear taking some notice of it here, it representing in some measure the just sentiments of those ancient Christians who considered their religion as a divine institution of virtue.

'It is no secret,' says he, 'that the God whom we Christians worship, is the one God declared to us by Christ, and by the Holy Ghost inspired in our hearts.'

'I own, that we also once trusted in gods of our own making. — But Almighty God, commiserating the errors of mankind, sent his wisdom into this world, clothed in flesh, to teach us the knowledge of God, who made the heavens and the earth, who is eternal and invisible. He moreover gave us a rule of life, and delivered to us the precepts of righteousness: he taught us to practise sobriety, to rejoice in poverty, to be very meek, to be willing to suffer, to preserve the purity of our minds, and to be patient at all times. He likewise foretold the things which have since happened to us; that we should be brought before kings and rulers, and be slaughtered as victims: for which cause also, though he was immortal, as being the Word and Wisdom of God, he yielded himself to death, that whilst he was in the body he might set us an example of patience. Nor did he deceive us by dying, but on the third day rose again:—being innocent, and unspotted, and undergoing death only that he might overcome it by rising again.

^d Huet Dem. Ev. Prop. iii. §. viii. p. 30.

^e Apologiam ad Præsidem ante martyrium A. C. 311. Nicomediae dictam, cujus meminit Eusebius ix. 6. Rufinus in Latina sua versione ex Actis, ut videtur, martyrii ejus,—excerptam exhibet. Fabr. B. G. T. v. p. 279.

^f See Tillem. as before, p. 145, 146.

^g —Fateor, erravimus etiam nos aliquando, et simulachra quæ finximus, deos cœli ac terræ putabamus auctores.—Verum omnipotens Deus—errores miseratus humanos Sapientiam suam misit in hunc mundum carne vestitam, quæ nos doceret Deum, qui cœlum fecit et terram, non in manufactis, sed in æternis atque invisibilibus requirendum. Vitæ enim nobis leges, ac disciplinæ præcepta constituit; servare parsimoniam, paupertate gaudere, mansuetudinem colere, studere

pati, puritatem cordis complecti, patientiam custodire. Sed et omnia hæc quæ nunc adversum nos geritis, ventura nobis esse prædixit; educendos nos ad reges, et ante tribunalia judicum statuendos, ac velut victimam jugulandos. Inde est denique, quod et ipse qui erat immortalis, utpote Verbum et Sapientia Dei, morte se præbuit, quo nobis in corpore positus patientiæ præberet exemplum. Sed nec nos sua morte decepit, quibus post tertium diem resurrexit: non ut ista quæ nunc falso conscribuntur continent Acta Pilati: sed innocens, immaculatus et purus, ad hoc solum mortem suscepit, ut eam vinceret resurgendo. Quæ autem dico, non sunt in obscuro gesta loco, nec testibus indigent. Pars pene jam mundi major huic veritati ad stipulatur, urbes integre. Euf. H. E. Vers. Ruf. l. ix. c. 6. p. 202.

'These

p. 294.

‘ These things are well attested, and a large part of the world
 ‘ now acknowledgeth the truth of them.’

3. There is likewise a Creed, or Formulary of Faith, concerning the trinity, which is sometimes called Lucian’s. Fabricius reckoning up our martyr’s works speaks of this among the rest. I shall put his words in the ^h margin: but I am by no means of opinion that this is one of Lucian’s little books, or discourses concerning the Faith, mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue: I rather think that Jerom intends Lucian’s Apology, made a little before his martyrdom, or some other short treatises in defence of the Christian religion. Rufinus, a contemporary, useth the same word with Jerom, when he introduceth ⁱ the speech, or apology, which Lucian made before the president at Nicomedia, calling it, A Discourse concerning the Faith; which was not a formulary of the doctrine of the trinity, but an apology for the Christian religion in general.

Bishop Bull ^k readily allowed this Formulary to be Lucian’s: but let us consider the testimony of antiquity. Sozomen informs us, that ^l ‘ the Eusebians in a synod at Antioch published a Formulary, which they said was Lucian’s the martyr.’ But Sozomen adds, ‘ he did not know whether they spake truth, ‘ or whether they endeavoured to recommend their own composition under the authority of the martyr:’ whereas it seems to me, that if there had been extant any such piece of Lucian, Sozomen must have known it. Moreover, the Creed, which Sozomen is supposed to refer to, is at length in ^m Athanasius, ⁿ Hilar-ry, and ^o Socrates: but they none of them call it Lucian’s; nor do they say that it was published as his. In one of the five Dialogues concerning the Holy Trinity, the age of which is not certainly known, except that they could not be written much before the end of the fourth century, the Macedonian asks the Orthodox, if he believed as the blessed Lucian did? to which the Orthodox answers, he believes as did all the martyrs and apostles. The Macedonian asks again, whether he would subscribe Lucian’s Formulary; or, whether there was in it any thing which he condemned? the Orthodox then tells him, that

^h Præterea, brevis fidei formula—
 existat apud Athanasium de Synodis—T.
 i. p. 892, et Socratem ii. 10. quamque
 Synodi Antiochenæ. (A. C. 341) patres,
 Luciani esse affirmant apud Sozomenum
 iii. 5. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 279.

ⁱ Tum ille, data sibi facultate dicendi,
 huiusmodi orationem de fide nostra habu-
 isse dicitur. Rufin. ubi supr, ^k Def,

Fid. Nic. cap. 3. Sect. ii. n. 6. ^l Ελεγον
 δε ταυτην την πιστιν ολογραφον ευρηκαμεναι
 Λυκκιανου, —ποτιον δε αληθως ταυτα εφασαν,
 η την ιδιαν γραφην σημειοποιοντες τω αξιωμα-
 τι τω μαρτυρος, λεγειν ηκ εχω. Sozom. l. iii,
 c. 5. p. 503, A. ^m De Synod. T. i. p.
 735, 736. ⁿ Hilar. de Synod. p. 1168,
 1169, Conf. ib. not. ^l p. 1168, Ed. Be-
 ned, ^o Socrat. l. ii, c. 10.

he

he ^p dislikes the addition which his friends had made, and that he could prove it to be an addition of theirs. There does not then appear to be sufficient reason to consider that Formulary as Lucian's.

V. This brings us at length to a difficult question, which cannot well be omitted, relating to Lucian's belief in the trinity. We have seen divers testimonies very favourable to him in Eusebius, Chrysostom, Jerom, Rufinus, Sozomen. His edition of the Seventy was esteemed by many. His memory was honoured by Constantine and others; nor is there in Jerom or Athanasius any censure passed upon his faith. Who could have thought that there should be any reason to doubt whether Lucian was orthodox? and yet it is questioned: for Arius concludes his letter ^q to Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, calling him Collucianist: the reason of which seems to be what is said by Epiphanius, that ^r Lucian and Eusebius had lived together in Nicomedia: and Arius I think must have supposed them of one opinion, and of the same opinion with himself. Epiphanius in his Anchoret says, that ^s Lucian and all the Lucianists denied that the Son of God took a soul, and taught that he took flesh only. Again, in the same work, he speaks ^t of the Lucianists and Arians as one sect: and in his Panarium, in his article of the old Lucianists, he distinguisheth ^u between the ancient Lucian, follower of Marcion, and Lucian who lived, he says, in the time of Constantine, whom the Arians call a martyr, and who was inclined to the Arian heresy. According to ^v Philostorgius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and others of the chief of the Arians, were disciples of Lucian; Maris of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nice, Leontius of Antioch, Asterius the sophist, and others; which induced Dupin to say that all the heads of that party were Lucian's disciples: and, not to add any thing more, Alexander in his letter to his namesake of Constantinople says, that ^y Lucian, succeeding [or following] Paul of Samosata, remained for a long time, ^z during three bishops, excommunicated, or separated from the

^p Κατηγορεῖται τῆς προσθηκῆς, ἢ προσεθηκεῖται· καὶ ἐχρὶ δεῖξαι, ὅτι προσεθηκεῖται ἐναντία αὐτῆς. De S. Trin. Dial. iii. ap. Athan. T. ii. p. 507. B. Ed. Bened.

^q συλλαγκιστῆς, ἀληθῶς Εὐσεβίῃ. ap. Epiph. H. 69. p. 732. A.

^r — ἀλλὰ Λυκίανον ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ συμ-
βιωῶντος. Epiph. ib. p. 730. B.

^s Λυ-
κιανὸς γὰρ, καὶ πάντες Λυκιστῆς ἀρνοῦνται
τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ ψυχὴν ἐληφέναι· σὰρκα μὲν
μόνον φασὶν ἐσχηκεῖναι. κ. λ. Epiph. Ancor.
n. xxxiii. T. ii. p. 38. C.

^t ib. n.
xxxv. p. 40. D.

^u Λυκίανος τῆς ἀρ-

χαιοῦ, ὃν ὁ υἱὸς ἐν χρόνῳις Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ γι-
νοντος γεγονώς, ὃν δὲ θενοὶ ἀριανοὶ ἐν μαρτυρίᾳ
ἐπιφθίζονται πρὸς γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Λυκίανος
φησὶν, προσεσχηκέναι τῇ τῶν ἀριανῶν αἰρέσει.
Epiph. H. 43. n. i. p. 378.

^v Ὅτι
τῶν τῶν μαρτύρων πολλὰς μὲν καὶ ἀλλὰς μα-
ρτυρίας ἀναγράφει, οἷς καὶ Εὐσεβίῳ τοῦ Νικο-
μηδείας, καὶ Μαρὶν τοῦ Χαλκεδόνος, κ. λ.
Philost. l. ii. c. xiv. p. 475. A. Vid. ib.
c. 12, 13, p. 474, et c. 3, p. 470.

^y Ὁν διαδόχοντος Λυκίανος ἀποστειλαγὼς
ἐκείνης τριῶν ἐπισκοπῶν πολυετὴς χρόνῳ.
Alex. ap. Thdr. H. E. l. i. c. 4. p. 15. B.

church: those three bishops are supposed to be ^a Domnus, Timæus, and Cyril; which last was succeeded by ^a Tyrannus.

Learned men are not agreed in their interpretation of those words; some supposing them to mean that ^b Lucian, following the sentiments of Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, separated himself from the communion of the church: others, that ^c he was by three successive bishops excluded from communion. It is, however, the general opinion of learned moderns, that Lucian did not always continue separated, or excommunicated: they agree in supposing that ^d those words of Alexander afford reason to conclude that Lucian returned, or was restored, to the catholic communion before his death; and probably, in the beginning of the episcopate of Tyrannus, who ^e succeeded Cyril about the year 297, near the end of the third century, or however before Dioclesian's persecution, which began in February 303.

That passage of Alexander would lead us to think that Lucian was in the sentiments, or at least in the interests, of Paul of Samosata; and ^f that for some reasons he greatly disliked the act of the council which deposed Paul. And there are other things which may be reckoned of some moment: for in the former part of the Creed ascribed to Lucian there are some expressions which seem over-orthodox; insomuch that bishop Bull ^g could not forbear to say, they are stronger than any used by the council of Nice: and, if so, others may be apt to conclude they must be Sabellian; though in the latter part of the same Creed ^h are ex-

^a Vid. Hieron. Chr. p. 176, 177.

^b Antiochiæ decimus nonus constituitur episcopus Tyrannus. ib. p. 179.

^c Causa itaque schismatis Luciani fuit doctrina Pauli Samosatani, quam defendebat; cuius gratiâ diu separavit se a tribus episcopis Antiochenis, Domno scilicet Timæo ac Cyrillo, qui sibi invicem succedere. Pagi Ann. 311. n. xi. Catechismus huius verbi αποσυναγωγος εμεινι, κ. λ. vim non intellexere interpretes, quos secutus Baronius scribit, Lucianum a tribus episcopis sibi continue succedentibus, ecclesia ejectum fuisse. Atqui hoc non dicit Alexander, sed tantum ait, Lucianum schisma fecisse in Antiocheni ecclesia, et sub tribus episcopis sibi continue succedentibus Collectas seorsum celebrasse. Id enim significat vox αποσυναγωγος. Id. ib. n. xii.

^e Paulo Samosateno succedens Lucianus ecclesiastica societate trium episcoporum segregatus pluribus annis permansit.—Hanc Alexandri esse mentem nobis persuasissimum.—Αποσυναγωγος εμεινι, non actum hominis se separantis, sed passivam potius ejectionem significat, &c. Balthag.

Ann. 312. n. xxiii. Conf. Tillem. S. Lucien. Not. 3, p. 405.

^d Tandem vero ad unitatem ecclesiæ reversus est Lucianus, ut ex Alexandro colligitur. Pagi. Ann. 311, n. xii. Extra dubium igitur est, Lucianum in errorem incidisse, ex quo tamen Deo favente tandem emeruisse putamus. Balth. ubi supra.

^e See Tillem. in St. Lucien, p. 149, and note 4, Mem. T. v. P. iii.

^f See before, p. 92.

^g Imo pene ausim affirmare, absolutam Filii divinitatem aliquatenus in Lucianæ Symbolo efficacius et significantius exprimi, quam in ipso Nicæno. Quippe verba illa, Deum ex Deo, totum ex toto, perfectum ex perfecto, quæ confessionis Lucianæ sunt, perfectam Filii divinitatem, et æqualem paternæ naturam, disertius annunciant, quam ista Nicæni Symboli, &c. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 146.

^h τῶν ὀνομάτων ἢ ἀπλῶς, ἢ δι' ἀργῶν καί μενῶν, ἀλλὰ σημαίνοντων ἀκριβῶς τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκαστὴ τῶν ὀνομαζομένων ὑπόστασιν τε καὶ δοξάν καὶ τάξιν· ὡς εἶπαι τῇ μὲν ὑπόστασι τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓς. ap. Socr. l. ii. c. 10. p. 88. A.

pressions favourable to Arianism; which may be what the Orthodox Christian, in the Dialogue before referred to, calls an addition, and says is contrary to Lucian's Creed: meaning, perhaps, the former part (B) of it. Moreover, it may be thought by some that Lucian, in the speech preserved by Rufinus, speaks not of the Word, or Logos, as a distinct person, but only as the Wisdom of God.

But how shall we reconcile this with the high esteem paid to Lucian by the Arians of the fourth century? For certainly Paulianism, or Sabellianism, and Arianism, are very different: it would likewise be hard to conceive how Eusebius, who was exceedingly averse to the Sabellian scheme, should say that Lucian was an excellent man in all respects.

Upon the whole, it is very difficult to reconcile the accounts concerning Lucian, or to determine where his fault lay, if he was guilty of any. As the Arians in general, and many catholics of the fourth century, shewed a great regard to the name of Lucian, some may be apt to infer there must have been two persons of that name; but that is an opinion which does not seem to be at all countenanced by antiquity; and we are, I think, obliged to suppose one and the same person to be intended all along.

VI. Whether Lucian's opinion concerning the trinity, particularly concerning the Word, was the same with that which is now reckoned orthodox, or not, which is a point not easily decided; we have seen other accounts of him which are unquestioned: and all must be satisfied that he was a pious, learned and diligent man; that he believed Jesus to be a divine teacher and the Christ. Lucian made out an edition both of the Old and the New Testament: Jerom indeed does not commend this last, Lucian having admitted into his copies some readings and passages which he did not reckon genuine: as this is the only fault found by Jerom, it may be concluded that the work was unexceptionable in other respects; or at least that Lucian's canon of the scriptures of the New Testament was much the same with that of other Christians.

And every serious reader, I presume, has with joy observed this additional testimony to the truth of the Christian religion, which this presbyter of Antioch asserted and adorned by the virtues and literary labours of his life, and by a death worthy of praise.

(B) Though I have argued as above, I certainly do not take any part of the Creed ascribed to Lucian to be his.

C H A P. LIX.

PAMPHILUS, presbyter of Cæsarea.

- I. *His history, and testimonies to him.* II. *An account of some others who suffered martyrdom about the same time with Pamphilus.* III. *Of the library erected by Pamphilus at Cæsarea.* IV. *An edition of the Seventy by him and Eusebius from Origen's Hexapla.* V. *Books transcribed from others in that library, still remaining.* VI. *A school said to be set up by him at Cæsarea.* VII. *His Apology for Origen.* VIII. *Contents of the Acts of the apostles, composed by Pamphilus, or Euthalius.* IX. *His character.* X. *Critical remarks upon pretended acts of his passion.*

I. 'PAMPHILUS' a presbyter, friend of Eusebius bishop of Cæsarea, had such an affection for the (A) divine library [or had

* Pamphilus presbyter, Eusebii Cæsariensis episcopi necessarius, tanto bibliothecæ divinæ amore flagravit, ut maximam partem Origenis voluminum sua manu descripserit, quæ usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca habentur. Sed et in duodecim prophetas viginti quinque *εξηγησεων* volumina manu ejus exarata repperi, quæ tanto amplector et seruo gaudio, et Cræsi opes habere me credam. Si enim lætitia est unam epistolam habere martyris, quanto magis tot millia versuum, quæ mihi videtur sui sanguinis signasse vestigiis? Scripsit, antequam Eusebius scriberet, Apologeticum pro Origene, et passus est Cæsariæ Palæstinæ sub persecutione Maximini. Hier. de V. I. c. 75.

(A) — had such an affection for the divine library.] That is a literal translation, but the meaning is not very obvious. The phrase occurs again in the chapter of Eusebius, who, as Jerom there says, was very studious in the scriptures, and with Pamphilus a diligent searcher of the divine library: in scripturis studiosissimus, et bibliothecæ divinæ, cum Pamphilo martyre diligentissimus peruestigator. Upon both those places Fabricius says, that thereby is to be understood the sacred scriptures, and refers to Martianay's Prolegomena to the first tome of St. Jerom's works. Cave understood the phrase in the same manner; for speaking of Pamphilus he says: Tanto erga divinas literas studio exarsit, ut bibliothecam Cæsariæ exstruxerit. Hist. Lit. And Trithemius de Ser. Ec. c. 47. Pamphilus — tantis eo tempore apud Cæsaream libros

amore Scripturarum congregavit, ut in omni tempore nulla bibliotheca celebrior extiterit. Honorius, c. 76, et 82, copies Jerom exactly, and therefore is of no service to us. Sophronius translates literally, *Θιας βιβλιοθηκης*. Martianay, to whom Fabricius refers, says: Apud veteres bibliothecæ divinæ nomen obtinebant sacra volumina, quæ nunc temporis Biblia vocamus. Proleg. i. n. 1. But his proofs are not sufficient; his examples are not very numerous; one of them is that above concerning Eusebius. I here take notice of another of them: Eodem sensu Hieronymus Ep. 89. ad Augustinum, vetus instrumentum, seu volumina ejusdem vocat ecclesiæ bibliothecas. Vis, inquit, amator esse verus septuaginta interpretum? Non legas ea quæ sub asteriscis sunt, imo rade de voluminibus, ut veterum te fautorem probes. Quod si feceris, omnes ecclesiæ bibliothecas damnare cogeris: vix enim unus aut alter liber invenitur, qui ista non habeat. But I think the phrase ought there to be understood in its own natural sense, to denote the libraries of the churches, containing copies of the Old and New Testament. All churches had copies of the scriptures, and the repositories in which they were lodged might be called libraries: besides, some churches had large collections of books, and many copies of the scriptures; as the churches at Jerusalem and Cæsarea: which last library, as Jerom expressly says in a passage to be cited by and by, was dedicated to that church by

‘ had such a desire to form a well-furnished ecclesiastical library]
 ‘ that he wrote out with his own hand the greatest part of Ori-
 ‘ gen’s works, which are still in the library of Cæsarea; and be-
 ‘ sides, I have met with five-and-twenty volumes of Origen’s
 ‘ Commentaries upon the twelve prophets in his hand-writing;
 ‘ which I value and keep as if I had the treasures of Cræsus.
 ‘ For if it be a pleasure to possess one single epistle of a martyr,
 ‘ how much more must it be to have so many thousand lines,
 ‘ which he seems to me to have marked with the traces of his
 ‘ blood? He wrote before Eusebius of Cæsarea an Apology for
 ‘ Origen, and suffered at Cæsarea in Palestine in the persecution
 ‘ of Maximin.’

So writes Jerom in his Catalogue of ecclesiastical writers. I have placed this at the beginning as a summary of the life of this excellent person: I shall add more from him, as well as from other ancient writers, presently.

Pamphilus flourished, according to Cave, about the year 204; he was put into prison in the year 307, and accomplished his martyrdom^b in 309. Eusebius, speaking of Pamphilus, and some others, says they suffered after they had been imprisoned^c

by Pamphilus. Such a library there was likewise at Hippo in Africa in Augustine’s time: *Ecclæsiæ bibliothecam, omnesque codices diligenter posteris custodiendos semper jubebat.* Possid. in Vit. Aug. c. 31. And the word is used of the repository of a church which could not have in it many books. *Posteaquam perventum est in bibliothecam, inventa sunt ibi armaria inania.* Act. Purgat. Cæcil. ap. Du Pin. Optat. p. 168, a. f. There is another passage of Jerom, where, as I think, the phrase ought to be interpreted in the same manner: *Revolve omnium quos supra memoravi commentarios, et ecclesiæ bibliothecis frui, et magis concitato gradu ad optata ceptaque pervenies.* Ad Pamm. ep. 31, [al. 52], p. 244, in. Farther, if by the divine library we understand the sacred scriptures, we shall charge Jerom with a trifling tautology in his chapter of Eusebius: and it is observable that Jerom, commending ancient Christian writers, often mentions their diligence in studying the scriptures, or their skill in them, and always speaks plainly; but never useth this phrase, except in the chapters of Pamphilus and Eusebius: probably therefore he refers to their care in furnishing the library at Cæsarea, which consisted of copies of the scriptures, and commentaries upon them, and other works of Christian writ-

ters, as well as works of profane authors. A passage of Jerom in a letter to Marcella, speaking of that library, leads us directly to this sense. *Beatus Pamphilus, quum Demetrium—in sacræ bibliothecæ studio vellet æquare,—tunc vel maxime Origenis libros impensius prosequutus, Cæsariensi ecclesiæ dedicavit.* Ad Marcell. T. ii. col. 711. In my edition of Moreri’s Dictionary, which is called the tenth, printed in 1717, the article of Pamphilus begins in this manner: *S. Pamphile—avoit tant d’amour pour les livres, qu’il recueillit un tres-belle bibliothèque.* St. Pamphilus was so great a lover of books, that he collected a very handsome library, which, in short, I think, is what Jerom intends to say; that ‘ Pamphilus was so ambitious of making a numerous collection of authors, and especially of having a large and well furnished library of Christian ecclesiastical writings, that he spared no cost or pains to obtain his end, and even wrote out with his own hand many copies of such books.’ Therefore, finally, the connection confirms my interpretation.

^b Vid. Cav. H. L. in Pamphilo. Ruinart Acta Mart. p. 323, 324, 325.

^c Τῶν τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῶν δεινῶν χρόνῳ κατατρεφῶν. Euf. de Mart. Pal. c. 11, p. 337. A.

p. 308.

two whole years; but it is supposed by learned moderns that^d Pamphilus lay in prison only a year and some months, from the latter end of the year 307 to the 16th of February 309.

In the Acts of Pamphilus, in Simeon Metaphrastes, which^e Valeſius ſuppoſed to be taken from Eusebius, and Tillemont^f allows to be in the main right, it is said that^g Pamphilus was a native of Berytus, and there received the first rudiments of learning: and in Photius he is said to have been educated by^h Pierius. For my own part, I think that neither of these accounts is to be relied upon: but, admitting the truth of them, it must be supposed, I think, that Pamphilus having first made some progress in learning at Berytus, his native city, afterwards completed his studies at Alexandria, and then settled at Cæsarea, where he certainly resided a great part of his life.

From this person Eusebius receivedⁱ the surname of Pamphilus, or Pamphili. In the chapter before cited Jerom calls Pamphilus Eusebius's friend; he mentions this again in^k the chapter of Eusebius himself: and in another place he says that^l these two persons seemed to have but one soul.

Eusebius, the survivor, has given many testimonies of sincere respect for the memory of his friend: and, as he was to the last an admirer of his virtues, we may reasonably think him an imitator of them: he appears to have esteemed that friendship the chief happiness of his life; it is likely he improved by it. Indeed there are in Eusebius's remaining works divers most agreeable and affecting passages concerning this holy man; which therefore I intend to transcribe largely, and sometimes with the connection.

The thirty-second chapter of the seventh book of his Ecclesiastical History is entitled, 'Of such Ecclesiastical Men as have flourished in our time, and who of them lived to the demolition of the churches;' meaning the beginning of Dioclesian's persecution. After the mention of several, he says: 'At^m Cæsarea in Palestine, after Theotecnus succeeded Agapius, who, as we

^d See Tillem. Mem. T. v. P. iii. S. Pamphile, p. 68, et note iii. ^e Vid.

Valeſ. Ann. in Euf. p. 179, 180.

^f Tillem. ib. p. 55.

^g Atque ortus quidem erat ex Berytenſium civitate, ubi in prima ætate educatus fuit in illis quæ

illuc erant ſtudiis literariis. Ex Sim. Met.

ap. Valeſ. ib. p. 180. Conf. Fabric. Hip-

pol. T. ii. p. 220, m. ^h Vid. Phot.

Cod. 118, f. et 119, in. p. 300.

ⁱ ἐπεὶ ἡμεῖς Πάμφιλος, καὶ ὁ ἐξ αὐτῆς χρεώματις νοτερός. Socr. l. iii. c. 7, p. 175.B.

Γιγνομεν δὲ καὶ τῆς Πάμφιλος τῆς ἐξομαρτυροῦς ἀρετῆς διαπύρος ἡρώτης· δι' ἣν αὐτὴν φασὶν τινὲς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς τῆς Πάμφιλος ἰσχυρῆς μετεσχηματῆς. Phot. Cod. 13, p. 12, m.

^k Ob amicitiam Pamphili martyris ab eo cognomentum sortitus est. De V. I. c. 81.

^l Eusebius et Pamphilus tantam inter se habuere concordiam, ut unus animæ homines putes, et ab uno alter nomen acceperit. Hier. de Err. Orig. ad Pamm. et Ocean. Ep. 41, [al. 65] T. iv. p. 347, f.

^m H. E. l. vii. c. 32, p. 283, C. D.

‘well know, was extremely laborious, and very solicitous for the
 ‘welfare of his people, and bountiful to the poor. In his time
 ‘was Pamphilus, a (B) man of good understanding, a philoso-
 ‘pher in word and deed, presbyter of that church, with whom
 ‘we had the honour to be acquainted: but to write of him is a
 ‘copious subject; and we have already in a distinct work related
 ‘the whole history of his life and conversation, [or, and ⁿ of the
 ‘school erected by him,] and of his fortitude in several confes-
 ‘sions during the persecution, and lastly the martyrdom with
 ‘which he was crowned: indeed, Pamphilus was the most ad-
 ‘mirable person in that church.’

In another chapter and book of the same work, speaking of
 the most illustrious martyrs in several countries in the time of
 the forementioned persecution: ‘Among ⁿ these must not be
 ‘omitted the great glory of the church of Cæsarea, the presby-
 ‘ter Pamphilus, the most admirable person of our time, whose
 ‘glorious magnanimity and patience we have represented in an-
 ‘other place.’

In his book of the History of the Martyrs of Palestine, relating
 many cruel torments inflicted on the Christians by the Roman
 president at Cæsarea, in the year of Christ 307: ‘And others,’
 says ^r Eusebius, ‘he thrust into prison, after he had tormented
 ‘them in the most shameful manner: of this number was Pam-
 ‘philus, my dearest friend, on account of his eminent virtue the
 ‘most renowned martyr of our age. Urbanus, having first made
 ‘trial of his knowledge by divers questions of rhetoric and phi-
 ‘losophy and polite literature, required him to sacrifice; when
 ‘he saw that Pamphilus refused to obey his orders, and despised
 ‘all his threatenings, he commanded that he should be tortured
 ‘in the severest manner: when he had again and again raked his
 ‘sides with his torturing irons, the cruel wretch, being as it were
 ‘satiated with his flesh, though he had gained nothing but vex-
 ‘ation and dishonour, ordered him to be had away to the rest of
 ‘the confessors in prison.’

And afterwards: ‘But ^q it is time to give an account of the most
 ‘glorious spectacle of those who were perfected by martyrdom
 ‘together with Pamphilus, whose memory must always be pre-
 ‘cious to me: they were in all twelve, and were honoured with
 ‘a resemblance of the prophets, or rather the apostles, both in

(B) or, a most eloquent man; *Μαγισ-
 μωτατος. Virum disertissimum. Valef. Verf.*

^a *κατα δε τῶν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐκείνων συ-
 νεγραφο διατίθενται. Singula quæ ad illius
 vitam et ad scholam ab eodem constitutam*

pertinent. Valef. Verf.

13. p. 308. B.

C. 7. p. 319. A. B.

336. A. B. C.

^o 1. viii. c.

^p De Martyr. Palest.

^q ib. cap. xi. p.

‘grace and number; the chief of whom was Pamphilus, and
‘the only one who had the honour of the presbyter’s office at
‘Cæsarea; a man, who, throughout his whole life, excelled in
‘every virtue; in contempt and renunciation of this world, in
‘liberality to the indigent, in disregard of all earthly honours
‘and preferments to which he might have aspired, and in an
‘abstemious philosophical course of life: but he was espe-
‘cially eminent and remarkable above all men of our time for
‘an unfeigned zeal for the holy scriptures, and for unwearied
‘application in whatever he undertook; whether it were kind
‘offices to his friends, or to others who sought his aid: but a
‘fuller account of these, and his other virtues and services, has
‘been already given by us in a distinct work of three books,
‘comprising the history of his life. At present we go on with
‘our narration concerning the martyrs.’

That work to our great grief is lost: but there is a passage of
it in Jerom, which I shall here transcribe: ‘Eusebius, the friend
‘and admirer and constant companion of Pamphilus, wrote three
‘excellent books containing the life of Pamphilus; in which, as
‘he greatly commends him on other accounts, so he particularly
‘extols his humility: and in the third of those books he writes
‘after this manner: What studious person was not a friend of
‘Pamphilus? If he saw any in straits, he gave bountifully as he
‘was able. He not only lent out copies of the sacred scriptures
‘to be read, but cheerfully gave them to be kept; and that not
‘only to men, but to women likewise, whom he found disposed
‘to read. For which reason he took care to have by him many
‘copies of the scriptures, that, when there should be occasion, he
‘might furnish those who were willing to make use of them:
‘but of his own he wrote nothing, except letters to friends; so
‘great was his humility: but he diligently read the works of
‘ancient authors, and was continually meditating upon them.’

II. I shall here insert a passage or two concerning some other
persons who suffered with Pamphilus, or soon after, and re-

ἡ δὲ βίβλος ταύτην ἔχει τὴν ἀρχὴν οὕτως·
h. B. Ipse enim Eusebius amator
et praeceps et contubernalis Pamphili tres li-
bros scripsit elegantissimos, vitam Pamphili
continentes: in quibus quum cetera miris
laudibus praeclaret, humilitatem ejus fer-
ret in caelum, etiam hoc in tertio libro ad-
didit: Quis studiosorum amicus non fuit
Pamphili? Si quos videbat ad victum ne-
cessarius indigere, praebebat large quæ po-
terat. Scripturas quoque sanctas non ad
legendum tantum, sed ad habendum tri-

buebat promptissime: Nec solum viris, sed
et feminis, quas vidisset lectioni deditas.
Unde et multos codices praeeparabat, ut
quum necessitas poposcisset, volentibus lar-
giretur. Et ipse quidem proprii operis
nihil omnino scripsit, exceptis epistolis,
quas ad amicos forte mittebat: in tantum
se humilitate deiecerat. Veterum autem
tractatus scriptorum legebat studiosissime,
et in eorum meditatione jugiter versaba-
tur. Hieron. adv. Ruf. col. 357, 359, T.
iv. Ed. Bened.

sembled him in a high regard for the sacred scriptures: our narration is thereby somewhat interrupted, but it will be easily excused.

The first of those passages immediately follows that above cited, which concluded with those ^t words: 'At present we go on with our relation concerning the martyrs.'

'The ^u second person,' says Eusebius, 'and next after Pamphilus, who entered the combat, was Valens, a deacon of (c) ^e Ælia, an old man of gray hairs and venerable aspect, exceedingly ^x well skilled in the divine scriptures: and they were so fixed in his memory that there was no discernible difference between his reading and reciting them by heart, though it were whole pages together.'

That person suffered with Pamphilus. The other passage which I would allege relates to a martyr in 310, who suffered in company with Silvanus, bishop of Gaza, who ^y in the year 307 had the flexures of his feet seared with hot irons at Cæsarea, and was then, with nine-and-thirty others, sent ^z to work in the copper mines at a place in Palestine called Phæno; where he continued till he was beheaded. Their martyrdom, in 310, is related by Eusebius in this manner: 'The ^a first of these was Silvanus, a truly religious man, and a complete model of Christianity; of whom it may be said, that, having from the first day of the persecution signalized himself in various and almost continual confessions and combats, he was reserved to this time to be as it were the seal of the ^b comb at in Palestine. With him there were many others from Egypt; and among them was John, who in strength of memory surpassed all men of our time: he had before lost his eyesight; nevertheless, in the confessions he had made, when the flexures of one of his feet were seared, as (v) those of others were, his eyes likewise, though

'already

^t See before, p. 339.

^u De Mart.

Pal. c. 11, p. 336. C. D.

(c) Ælia; that is, Jerusalem; or the city just by it, so called by Adrian. And the name of Jerusalem was now so lost and forgotten, that when one of these martyrs, being examined by the president of Palestine concerning his native place, answered, that his city was Jerusalem, meaning the heavenly Jerusalem: the president, not knowing any such place, was thrown into surprise, and very solicitously sought to know where it lay; thinking it to be some city where Christians were numerous, and might be formidable. See Euf. p. 337, 338.

^x τὰς δυνάμεις γραφῶν ἐν καὶ τῆς ἀλλοῦς ἐπιστήμῳν. ^y — ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει τῶν

ἀμφὶ σιδήρων — τοῖς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ χαλκῷ μεταλλῶν ποιεῖν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐκκεῖναι κατεῖχεν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὰς ἀρχαίας αὐτῆς πύλας. De M. P. cap. 7, p. 328. C.

^z — τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ παλαιστίνῃ μαρτύρων, σιδήρων ἐπισκοπῶν τῶν ἀμφὶ τῇ γαζῇ ἐκκλησιῶν, κατὰ τὰ ἐν φαίνῃ χαλκῷ μεταλλῶν σιδηροῦς ἐνὸς δεικνύον τὸν ἀριθμὸν τεσσαρῶν κατὰ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτίμῃται. H. E. l. viii. c. 13, p. 308. B.

^a — ἰδὲναι τὴν χεῖρα καὶ γυμνασιὸν ὑποδείγματι χριστιανῶν. Οἰκον. κ. λ. De Mar. Pal. c. 13, p. 341. D. 344.

^b — ὡς ἀνὴρ αὐτὸν γυμνῶν πᾶν τὸν κατὰ παλαιστίνῃ ἀγῶνι ἐπιβήτην. ib. p. 343. D. (v) That severity of searing the sinews of the left foot, or leg, and searing the right eye, was practised

p. 318.

‘already deprived of sight, were burned with the searing irons: such was the cruelty and inhumanity of those executioners! It is needless to enlarge upon his virtue and philosophical course of life. What was most remarkable in him was the strength of his memory: he had whole books of the divine scriptures, not written in tables of stone, as the apostle’s expression is, nor on parchments and papers, which are devoured by moths and time, but on the fleshly living tables of his heart, even his pure and enlightened mind: insomuch, that whenever he pleased he brought out, as from a treasury of knowledge, sometimes the books of Moses, at other times those of the prophets, or some sacred history, sometimes the gospels, sometimes the epistles of apostles. I must own,’ says Eusebius, ‘that I was much surprised the first time I saw him: he was in the midst of a large congregation, reciting a portion of scripture; whilst I only heard his voice, I thought he was reading, as is common in our assemblies; but when I came near, and saw this person, who had no other light but that of the mind, instructing like a prophet those whose bodily eyes were clear and perfect, I could not forbear to praise and glorify God.’

III. Pamphilus erected a library at Cæsarea: Eusebius mentions it in his Ecclesiastical History. He is speaking of the time of several of Origen’s works, and of the places where they were composed: ‘But,’ says^d he, ‘what need I attempt to give here an exact catalogue of the works of that great man, when it has been already done in the life we have written of the blessed martyr Pamphilus? Where,’ shewing the zeal of Pamphilus for the interest of religion [or^e for the sacred scriptures,] we gave lists of the works of Origen, and of other ecclesiastical writers collected by him, and placed in his library.’

Jerom insinuates that^g in the third book of that work Eusebius inserted a catalogue of all Origen’s works; whereas Eusebius’s own words just cited seem not to imply a complete catalogue, but such works only of Origen as were in the library at (E) Cæsarea.

placed upon great numbers of confessors by Eusebius, president of Cæsarea, successor of Urbanus, who put Pamphilus into prison. Vid. Euf. de Mart. Pal. c. 8, p. 330. B. C.

^a — — — *ὅλας βιβλίας τῶν ὁσίων* Ruf. ib. p. 344. A. ^d Euf. l. vi. c. 35, p. 231. A. B.

^e — — — *ἐν ᾗ τῇν περὶ τῆς βίβλου σπουδῆς τῆς παμφίλου ὁποῦν τῆς ἰστορίας παρρησιαί, τῆς συλαχθείσης αὐτοῦ τῶν ἐργῶν καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραμμάτων βιβλιοθήκης τῆς πικρίας παρθε-*

μην. ib. p. 231. B.

^f So Valesius translates: Ubi cum probare vellemus, quantum Pamphili studium erga divinas literas fuisset, —

^g Numera indices librorum ejus, qui in tertio volumine Eusebii, in quo scripsit vitam Pamphili, continentur: et non dico sex millia, sed tertiam partem non invenies. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. p. 419. in.

(E) Compare this with what is said in the chapter of Origen, Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii. numb. 1.

Jerom has several times mentioned that library: he seems to me to refer to it ^h in the two chapters of Pamphilus himself and Eusebius, when he speaks of the divine library. But not now to insist on those passages, in his article of St. Matthew he says ⁱ that his Hebrew gospel was still in the library at Cæsarea, which Pamphilus had collected with great care. In another place he speaks of the gospel according to the Hebrews, as ^k being in that library: in the same work, (his book Of Illustrious Men,) in the article of Euzoius, bishop of Cæsarea, about 366, he says, 'that ^l Euzoius had with abundance of pains repaired the library of 'Origen and Pamphilus, which was fallen to decay.' In a letter to Marcella, Jerom ^m commends this design of Pamphilus, and compares his library with the more ancient celebrated libraries of Demetrius Phalereus and Pisistratus. He there speaks again of the care of Euzoius; and likewise of Acacius, the immediate successor of Eusebius in the see of Cæsarea, in repairing this library: and he says that Pamphilus dedicated the books of Origen, which he had collected at great expense, to the church of Cæsarea; whence perhaps it may be inferred that this was a public library: and indeed we know, from Jerom himself, that ⁿ he had the use of some books lodged in it.

IV. There was a joint labour of Pamphilus and Eusebius in publishing a correct edition of the Greek version of the Seventy from Origen's Hexapla, which I have already taken notice of in

^h See before, p. 335, note (A).

ⁱ Porro ipsum hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit. De V. I. c. 3.

^k In Evangelio juxta Hebræos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebræicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthæum; quod et in Cæsariensi habetur bibliotheca. Adv. Pelag. I. iii. T. iv. col. 533, m.

^l — plurimo labore corruptam bibliothecam Origenis et Pamphili in membranis instaurare conatus est. De V. I. c. 113.

^m Beatus Pamphilus martyr, cuius vitam Eusebius Cæsariensis tribus ferme voluminibus explicavit, quam Demetrium Phalereum et Pisistratum in sacræ bibliothecæ studio vellet aquare, imagineque ingeniorum, quas vera sunt et æterna monumenta, toto orbe perquireret, tunc vel maxime Origenis libros impensis prosequutus, Cæsariensi ecclesiæ dedicavit: quam ex parte corruptam Acacius, dehinc et Euzoius, ejusdem ecclesiæ sacerdotes, in membranis

instaurare conati sunt. Ad Marcell. inter Ep. Crit. T. ii. p. 711, in. [al. Ep. 141] Conf. Ruf. ap. Hieron. T. iv. col. 426, f. 428, in.

ⁿ Præterea quintam et sextam et septimam editionem, quas etiam nos de ejus bibliotheca habemus, miralabore reperit, et cum cæteris editionibus comparavit. De V. I. c. 54. Unde et nobis curæ fuit omnes veteris Legis libros, quos vir doctus Adamantius in Hexapla digesserat, de Cæsariensi bibliotheca descriptos ex ipsis authenticis emendare. Id. in Ep. ad Tit. cap. iii. T. iv. P. i. col. 437. Id quod secundo dicitur, non sic, in Hebræis voluminibus non habetur: sed nec in ipsis quidem LXX. interpretibus. Nam in exemplis Origenis in Cæsariensi bibliotheca legens, semel tantum scriptum inveni. In Ps. prim. T. ii. P. ii. col. 121, in. Postea vero per interpretationem tuam, quaestione contra Origenem toto orbe commota, in quaerendis exemplaribus diligentior fui; et in Cæsariensi bibliotheca Eusebii sex volumina reperi *Ἀποδυναστεύου*, Adv. Ruf. T. iv. col. 447, f.

p. 323.

the chapter of ^o Lucian. Huet is of opinion, that ^r before this there was no separate edition of the 'Seventy according to Origen's emendations. Undoubtedly, this was a signal service for the church of Christ; the benefit of Origen's immense labour was rendered more extensive; and, if their edition was not the first, it was the most exact.

V. There are still extant in the curious collections of Europe memorials of this library of Pamphilus, and traces of his and Eusebius's labour in transcribing or correcting copies of the scriptures, or other books.

In the Jesuits' college at Paris ^q is a beautiful manuscript of the prophets, supposed ^r to have been written in the eighth century. In that manuscript, as Montfaucon assures us, there is before the book of Ezekiel a note to this purpose: 'This ^s was taken from a copy in such a place, in which copy was written: "Transcribed from the Hexapla containing the translations; and corrected by Origen's own Tetrapla, which also had emendations and scholia in his own hand-writing. I Eusebius added scholia; Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected."'

Huet, speaking of this same manuscript, in one place ^t says, that note is at the end of Jeremiah; in ^u another, before Ezekiel. I have put his words at the bottom of the page.

Z 4

In

^o See p. 326.

^p Apud multos hanc opinionem percerebuisse video, Origenem, quo parabilior esset emendata a se editio septuaginta, edidisse eam seorsum, et ex ingenti Hexaplorum mole exemisse. — Probabilior mihi videtur sententia I. B. Morini, — editionem illam ^q ex Origenianis Hexaplis descriptam ab Eusebio et Pamphilo, et primum evulgatam arbitrantis, iuxta illud Hieronymi in Pref. ad Paralip. ad Chromatium: — Melius inter has provincias Palestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt. Nam cum frequenter exciperentur exempla in ecclesiarum, doctorumque hominum usum, novis in dies deformabantur sordium inquinamentis. Degenerante ergo magis magisque hac editione, restituere eam conati sunt Eusebius et Pamphilus, ex ipso ^q autographo, quod erat in Casariensi Bibliotheca, restitutum vero et seorsum magna diligentia descriptam publicaverunt. Atque ex editio Palestina dicta est. Huet. Orig. l. iii. c. 2, p. 261.

^q Vetusissimum, pulcherrimumque codicem Prophetarum. — Montf. Praef. in Hex. Orig. p. 4.

^r Hec porro omnia dicimus ex Notis ^s Iulii Marchaliani, nunc R. R. P. P. ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j

In the French king's library, as we are informed by Montfaucon, is ^a a very ancient manuscript, written in the fifth or sixth century, containing part of St. Paul's epistles. It seems, he says, to have been written in Palestine, or Syria: for the transcriber says, in a note at the end, that he had compared his copy with another in the library of Cæsarea, in the hand-writing of Pamphilus: which therefore must have been done before that library was quite destroyed, as it was before the middle of the seventh century. In that Mss. the epistle to the Hebrews appears as St. Paul's. 'The order is ^y this: To the Romans, 'the first and second to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to 'the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, first and 'second to the Thessalonians, to the Hebrews, first and second 'to Timothy, to Titus, to Philemon.' That learned writer has given us that curious note of the transcriber beforementioned in the ancient letters of the manuscript. I place it at the bottom of the page in the letters now commonly used: 'This ^z book was 'compared with the copy in the library at Cæsarea, in the hand-writing of saint Pamphilus.'

VI. It is thought by divers learned men, as ^b Cave, ^c Valesius, and ^d Tillemont, though Du Pin takes no notice of it, that Pamphilus not only erected a library, but a school likewise, or academy, at Cæsarea. This supposition is chiefly built upon a passage of Eusebius, which ^e I have cited already. Tillemont however brings in ^f other passages in support of it. I must leave this point undecided. I dare not contest the thing. But the evidence is not clear, because the passage of Eusebius, where

scholia ad limbum aliqua adieciſſe Origenem diſcimus ex memorato Codice Marchali, quem habent Claromontani Patres Societatis Jeſu. Adnotatum enim eſt ante Ezechielem, librum hunc ex Hexaplis deſcriptum eſſe, correctum vero ad Tetraploium fidem. Poſtmodum ſubeſt: *αὐτὰ καὶ τὰ αὐτὴ χεὶρ διερῶτο, καὶ ἐσχο-
λογραφετο, ὅθεν εὐσεβίου ἐν τα σχολία πα-
ρεῖνκα. Πανφίλος καὶ εὐσεβίου διερῶσαντο.* Ib. p. 261, m. ^x Codex ccii. membranaceus, conſtans foliis 14, complectens partem Epiſtolarum Pauli, inter antiquiſſimos Europæ numerandus, ſæculi nempe v. vel. vi. — Scriptus eſſe videtur in Palæſtina vel Syria, eo circiter quo diximus *supra*. Nam Calligraphus, qui notum infra edendam in fine poſuit, hoc exemplar ſe contuliſſe ſignificat cum Codice ipſius Pamphili manu exarato: antequam videlicet Cæſarea funditus dirueretur, quod

contigit ante medium ſæculi vii. Montf. Bib. Coiſlin. p. 251, 252.

^y Ordo Epiſtolarum Pauli in Codice xxix. ſupra, ad Rôm. ad Corinth. 1, 2, ad Galat. ad Ephes. ad Philippienſ. ad Coloſenſ. ad Theſſalonienſ. 1, 2, ad Hebr. ad Timoth. 1, 2, ad Titum, ad Philemonem. Ib. p. 255, m.

^z *Ἀντιόχεια ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ πρὸς τὸ ἐν καίſαρια ἀντιγραφὴ τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ τῇ ἀγνῇ πανφίλου χεὶρ γράμ-
μειον.* Ap. Bib. Coiſl. ib. p. 262.

^b Pamphili vitam tribus libris amplexus eſt — Eusebius, quibus integrum vite ejus curriculum, quæque ad ſcholam ab eo inſtitutam pertinent, — accuratiſſime depinxit. Cav. H. L. de Pamphilo ad fin.

^c Vales. Annot. in Euseb. p. 160, B.

^d Saint Pamphile, ubi ſupra, p. 58.

^e See p. 338. ^f Vid. Euseb. de M. P. c. iv. p. 323, C. 324, A. B.

p. 328.

he is supposed to mention the school, is ^s obscure; and because there is no notice taken of this school, that I remember, in Jerom, nor any other ancient writer of credit.

VII. In the article above-cited at length Jerom says, that Pamphilus wrote an Apology for Origen before Eusebius: ^a and in the chapter of that bishop of Cæsarea he ascribes ^b to him an Apology for Origen in six volumes. It seems, therefore, that Jerom then supposed that Pamphilus had written some Apology for Origen, distinct from the six books of Eusebius; and upon that account gave Pamphilus a place in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, composed in 392; and also in his letter ⁱ to Magnus, written about the year 400. He seems so ^k to explain himself in the dispute which he afterwards had with Rufinus: when having found, as he says, that the book he had taken for Pamphilus's was the first of the six volumes of what he esteemed Eusebius's Apology for Origen, he denied that Pamphilus ever wrote any thing besides epistles to friends; and ^l often charged Rufinus with a fraud in publishing the first book of that Apology in a Latin translation, as a work of Pamphilus.

Nevertheless, whatever Jerom might think fit to say after his difference with Rufinus, the truth seems to be this: five

^a I shall here put down Eusebius's words, and divers Latin versions: *εκατα δε τη κατ' αμην δην, και ης συγγραμματο διατριβης. I. vii. c. 32, p. 288, D.* Verum nos singula quæ ad illius vitam et ad scholam ab eodem institutam pertinent,—peculiari opere complexi sumus. Valef. Omnem eius vitam institutionemque a puero. Ruf. Verum singula vitæ illius, et in qua schola institutus fuerit. W. Musculus. Quam ratione institutus. Christophorson. Et Conf. Valef. Annot. p. 160, B. And any one that pleaseth, may see how I have translated the passage, at p. 338.

^b *Απολογία pro Origene sex libros. De V. l. c. 81.* Nec non presbyterorum, Pamphili, Pierii.—Ep. 83, T. iv. p. 656.

ⁱ Nunc—sufficiat, breviter prudentem intruxisse lectorem, me istum librum, cuius nomine Pamphili ferebatur, vidisse tantum in codice tuo. Et quia mihi non erat cura quid pro hæretico diceretur, sic semper habuisse, quæ diversum esset opus Pamphili et Eusebii: postea vero quaestione tacta—perspicueque deprehendisse, quod primus liber sex voluminum Eusebii huius esset, qui unus sub nomine Pamphili huius esset.—Unde etiam ante annos sex decem, quam Dexter amicus meus me rogasset, ut auctorem nostræ re-

ligionis ei indicem texerem; inter ceteros tractatores posui et hunc librum a Pamphilo editum, ita putans esse, ut a te et tuis discipulis fuerat divulgatum. Sed quum ipse dicat Eusebius, Pamphilum nihil scripsisse, exceptis brevibus epistolis ad amicos: et primus liber sex voluminum illius eadem et eisdem verbis continent, quæ sub nomine Pamphili a te ficta sunt; perspicuum est te idcirco hunc librum disseminare voluisse, ut sub persona martyris hæresim introduceres. Quumque de hoc ipso libro, quem Pamphili simulas, multa perverteris, &c. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. T. 4. p. 419.

^l Referens enim de apologia Pamphili martyris, quam nos Eusebii Arianorum principis probavimus. Adv. Ruf. col. 407, in. Eusebius—per sex volumina nihil aliud agit, nisi ut Origenem suæ ostendat fidei, id est, Arianæ perfidiæ. ib. f. Conf. eund. p. 357, 359, 405; et Ep. ad Panm. et Ocean. p. 347. Fecerat hoc et in sancti Pamphili martyris nomine, ut librum primum sex librorum defensionis Origenis, Eusebii Cæsariensis, quem fuisse Arianum nemo est qui nesciat, nomine Pamphili martyris prænotaret. Ep. 43, ad Ctesiph. p. 477, in. Conf. eund. in libr. vi. in Ezech. c. xviii. T. iii. col. 821; et Prol. Dialog. adv. Pelag. T. iv. p. 484.

books

books of the *Apology* for Origen were composed jointly by Pamphilus and Eusebius: the sixth and last was written by Eusebius alone after the martyrdom of Pamphilus: for Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History* does expressly and openly refer his readers for a farther account of Origen to ^m the *Apology* composed by himself and Pamphilus. He soon after refers to the ⁿ sixth book of that *Apology* as his own. Socrates ^o speaks of their common labour in it as an allowed thing, and commends the work: yea, he quotes it in another place as ^p Pamphilus's, without mentioning Eusebius. Photius, though he is far from commending the performance, says, that ^q the first five books were written jointly by Pamphilus and Eusebius in prison, and the sixth by Eusebius alone afterwards. It is needless to allege any other ^r testimonies. Pamphilus, as well as Eusebius, was remarkable for the regard he had for Origen. St. Jerom knew that very well, and owns it sometimes: nor is it at all strange that they should have a high esteem for Origen, who continually had before them, in their library, the originals of those amazing works, his *Tetrapla* and *Hexapla*, and many other volumes of his writings, monuments of a most capacious mind and unexampled industry.

This work, against which ^s Jerom threatened to write, according to ^t his own acknowledgment, was laboured and copious. Indeed, it must have been a large work, as may be inferred from the length of (F) the first book, which ^u we still have in Rufinus's Latin translation; from ^x Eusebius's divers references to it for farther particulars concerning Origen; and from the accounts given ^y by some ancient authors of the contents of it.

Here I might make some extracts out of that first book which remains, to shew what books of scripture are referred to by the

^m ΤΑΥΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΥΠΕΡ ΑΥΤΗ ΠΕΠΟΙΗ-
ΜΕΝΗΣ ΗΜΙΝ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ Τῷ ΚΑΘ' ΗΜΑΣ ΚΕΚΩ ΜΑΡΤΥΡ
ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΥ ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ, ΠΑΡΕΣΤΙΝ ΑΝΑΛΕΞΕΣΘΑΙ.
I. vi. c. 33, p. 232.

ⁿ —ΕΝ ΕΚΤῳ ΤΗΣ
ΓΡΑΦΕΙΝΤΟΣ ΗΜΙΝ ΠΕΡΙ Τῆ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ. ib.
c. 36, p. 233.

^o ΤῶΤΩΝ ΑΞΙΟΠΙΣΤΟΙ, ΟΤΕ ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ—
ΕΥΣΕΒΙΟΣ* ΑΜΦΩ ΓΑΡ ΚΟΙΝῳ—ΕΠΙΘΕΤΟΙΣ ΒΙΒ-
ΛΙΚΟΙΣ ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑΝ ΥΠΕΡ ΑΥΤΗ ΠΕΠΟΙΗΜΕΝΟΙ, κ. λ.
Socr. I. iii. cap. 7, p. 175, B.

^p Id. I. iv. c. 27, p. 244, D.

^q —ΩΝ ΟΙ ΜΕΝ ΠΕΝΤΕ, ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΥ ΤΟ ΔΙΣ-
ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΟΝ ΟΙΚΗΝΤΙ, ΣΥΜΠΑΡΟΝΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΥΣΕΒΙΟΥ,
ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ* κ. λ. Phot. cod. 118, col.
296. vid. et col. 297, f.

^r Vid. *Prædestinat.* Haer. 45.

^s *Adversus quæ volumina, (si Dominus*

*vita hujus dederit spatium) alias respon-
dere conabor.* Adv. Ruf. I. ii. p. 419.

^t Sex libros Eusebius Cæsariensis episco-
pus, Arianae quondam signifer factionis,
pro Origene scripsit, latissimum et elabo-
ratum opus. Adv. Ruf. I. i. p. 357.

(F) Rufinus translated the first book,
and that only, so far as we know. He-
rum tu primum librum vertis sub nomine
martyris—Si totum opus Pamphili est,
cur reliquos libros non transfers? ib. I. i.
p. 357 ^u Ap. Hieron. Opp. T. v. p.
219, &c. Ed. Bened.

^x H. E. I. vi. c. 23, et 33, et 36.

^y Vid. Socr. I. iii. c. 7. I. iv. c. 27. Phot.
cod. 117, 118. Conf. Tillem. Saint Pam-
phile. T. v. P. iii. p. 60, 61.

composers,

composers, and by Origen, in the passages quoted from him : but it is needless. Considering Pamphilus's respect for Origen, and his intimacy with Eusebius, it may be taken for granted, that his canon of scripture was the same, or much the same, as theirs. And what theirs was, has been or will be shewn largely in this work.

VIII. Montfaucon has published Contents ^a of the Acts of the apostles, which he thinks to have been composed and drawn up by Pamphilus. As ^a the work is ascribed to Pamphilus in the manuscript, which ^b is supposed to be of the tenth century, so for that, and some other reasons, he makes no scruple to consider him as the author. The same thing has been put out again ^c by Fabricius as a work of Pamphilus. But those Contents ^d had been often published before without the name of the author : and the only thing uncommon is ^e the short preface to those Contents ; which too, with the Contents themselves, had been published ^f by Zacagni, as written by Euthalius, who ^g flourished about the year 458.

And indeed it seems to me more likely that Euthalius should be the author than Pamphilus. It is observable that Euthalius published the Acts of the apostles, the Catholic epistles, and St. Paul's epistles. At the end of his edition of the Catholic epistles, which follow that of the Acts of the apostles, is this note : 'The ^h book of the Acts of the apostles, and of the Catholic epistles, was collated with the exact copies of the library of Eusebius Pamphilus in Cæsarea.' Mr. Wetstein, to whom I refer my readers, has divers curious remarks concerning Euthalius. He is of opinion, that ⁱ this note has been an occasion of ascribing to Pamphilus, as author, what was really done by Euthalius, who made use of his library. However, we have here another proof of the usefulness of that library at Cæsarea.

^a Præmittitur Expositio Capitum Actuum auctore Pamphilo, εκθεσις κεφαλαιων των πραξεων τη παμφιλω, quam integram edimus infra. Mont. Bib. Coislin, p. 76.

^b Codex xxv. al. cxxi. membranaceus, decimi seculi, complectitur Acta apostolorum et epistolas catholicas. — Ib. p. 75.

^c Hanc opellam esse vere Pamphili martyris, non est quod dubitemus. ib. p. 78. la.

^d Vid. Fabr. Spic. Patr. seu Hippolyti Opera. P. ii. p. 205, &c.

^e Existat eadem εκθεσις line nomine auctoris ante Commentarios Oecumenii in Acta, atque inde in melioribus Novi Testamenti editionibus ; Rob. Stephani, Joh. Bechleri, et Joh. Millii : necnon in Dan. Heideggeri ad Nov. Test. Exercitationibus.

Fabr. ib. p. 209. ^e Ap. Bibl. Coislin. p. 78.

^f Ap. Laurent. Zacagni. Collectanea, p. 428.

^g Vid. Zacagni. Pref. p. 61, 62, et Cave H. Lit. T. i. p. 446. Oxon. 1740.

^h Απεδωκεν δε των πραξεων και καθολικων επιτολων το βιβλιον προς τα ακριβη αντιγραψας της εν καισαρειη βιβλιοθηκης εισεως τη παμφιλω. ap Zacagni. ib. p. 513.

ⁱ Quod præcipuum est, editionem suam cum exemplari Pamphili martyris, in Bibliotheca Cæsariensi asservato, contulit. — Inde error librorum ortus est, qui cum legerent, ab Euthalio Codicem Pamphili consultum esse, totum laborem Euthalii Pamphilo, tanquam potiori, adscripserunt. Wetst. Proleg. p. 76.

IX. It is now time that we reflect upon what we have met with concerning this martyr for the Christian religion. There can be no question but Pamphilus was an understanding and truly pious man. He was not distinguished only by the last scene of his life, the magnanimity, fortitude, and patience of his confessions and martyrdom; but his whole life was a shining example of virtue. He must have been a person of a good family, and a large estate: but he despised the world, and renounced all earthly expectations. He was a zealous Christian, and greatly delighted himself in the scriptures: he was liberal to the poor, kind to his acquaintance, and to all men who sought to him: he had an earnest desire to promote learning and knowledge, especially the knowledge of the holy scriptures, in men of every condition: and his diligence in all laudable undertakings was extraordinary. The testimonies to his virtue, which we have seen, are very agreeable: but if the large history of his life, written by Eusebius, were still in being, very probably it would be more entertaining, and inform us of many things of an edifying nature. It is one of those works of Eusebius, the loss of which is much lamented by learned men.

Where can such a man as this be found in the heathen world? how rare were such examples under the Mosaic institution, of men who employed their whole time in improving their own minds, and serving others, without noise and ostentation, and without worldly views, and at last quietly resigned their lives rather than disown the principles by which they had been hitherto conducted and supported!

Nor was Pamphilus alone, though distinguished. There were twelve in all, who at one and the same time bore the most signal testimony to truth. One^k of whom was a servant of Pamphilus, by name Porphyry; who, though he was burned at a stake, bore that painful death, and all the preceding tortures appointed by the cruel governor, with wonderful fortitude and resignation, serenity and patience. Not to insist now on the many others in Palestine, Egypt, and other places, who about this time signalized themselves by divers confessions, and at last by dying for their religion. Certainly these men, if they were not the best speakers, were the best lives that ever the world saw: and in their death they are without rivals. These holy and useful men, these confessors and martyrs, undaunted by all the evils which an unkind and mistaken world sometimes brings upon those who are its greatest blessings and best bene-

* Vid. Euseb. de Mart. Pal. c. xi. p. 338, 339.

p. 337.

factors, were formed by the Christian¹ religion when the evidences of it were near, and, if not true, their weakness might have been perceived. They were advanced by it to this eminence, when it was considered as an institution of virtue, not an abstruse and speculative science; a doctrine from heaven, not a creature of the state: and when Jesus, their Lord and Master, was not only admired as a divine teacher, but was also esteemed an example both in his life and in his death.

One thing, which frequently occurs in the authentic histories of these primitive Christians of note and distinction, deserves especial regard: I mean their affection and zeal for the holy scriptures. For their own sake, for the sake of others, and among them for our good, they were mightily taken up in reading, studying, explaining, and commenting upon the scriptures of the Old and New Testament; or in transcribing them, or correcting copies of them, and procuring exact editions, for the use of all sorts of persons. This is for our imitation, and for our satisfaction. It is what ought to be imitated by us: and it likewise affords us good reason to think that the books of holy scripture, which contain the revelations of the divine will to mankind, and are the rule of our faith, have been transmitted to us in great purity, without any remarkable alterations or deviations from the original writing.

X. Fabricius has published what he calls ^m Acts of the Passion of St. Pamphilus, taken out of his Life written by Eusebius of Cæsarea; from which I might have selected some things, and thereby possibly made my account of Pamphilus more agreeable to some: but I cannot persuade myself to make any use of that piece, not being satisfied of its genuineness.

Here it is not only said that he was of a noble family, which is very likely, but also thatⁿ he had honourably discharged civil offices in his country: which, I think, cannot be easily reconciled with Eusebius's genuine account; who says that^o Pamphilus re-

¹ Triumphus Dei est passio martyrum, et pro Christi nomine cruoris effusio, et inter tormenta letitia. Quum enim quis esset tanta perseverantia stare martyres, et torqueri, et in suis cruciatibus gloriam, odor notitiæ Dei disseminatur in gentes, et subit tacita cogitatio, quod nisi verum esset evangelium, numquam sanguine defenderetur. Neque enim delicata, et divitiis studens ac securâ confessio est; sed in carceribus, in plagis, in persecutionibus, in fame, in nuditate et siti. Hic triumphus Dei est, apostolorumque victoria. Hieron. ad Hedib. n. xi. T. iv. P. l. p. 134.

^m Acta Passionis S. Pamphili martyris ex libris Eusebii Cæsariensis de illius Vita, juxta MS. Medicæum Regis Christianissimi. Ap. Fabr. Spic. Patr. seu Hippolyti Opp. T. ii. p. 217, &c. Conf. ejusd. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 277, 278.

ⁿ — ἐπιστημῶς τε ταῖς κατὰ τὴν πατρίδα πολιτικαῖς διακρίσαντος. Act. Pass. ap. Fabr. p. 218, m. — fuisset autem insignis in republica gerenda in patria sua. Certamen Pamphili ex Metaphr. ap. Vales. Ann. in Euf. p. 179, b. in.

^o — κοσμητικῶν ἐπισημῶν ἀγαθῶν. Euf. de Mart. P. c. xi. p. 336, B.

nounced

nounced all worldly expectations;’ or, as Valesius translates the words, ‘despised’ all secular honours, to which he might have aspired.’ Eusebius does actually say of Phileas, bishop of Thmuis, that ^a he had with reputation enjoyed all civil offices and employments in his country. Why did he not expressly say the same of Pamphilus, if true, when he spoke of his contempt of this world?

Again, it is said in these Acts that ^r Pamphilus renounced, or gave away all his paternal estate to the poor, and that he himself lived a philosophical kind of life, having nothing of his own: but Eusebius in his genuine account only says that ^s Pamphilus was very bountiful to the indigent, or gave liberally out of his substance for the relief of such persons. That particular appears to me contrary to all the ancient authentic accounts which we have of Pamphilus. If he had renounced, or given away all his estate, how should he have erected a library? How could he have transcribed numerous copies of the books of scripture, and Commentaries upon them? How should he and Eusebius put out a correct edition of the Seventy from Origen’s Hexapla? In all these works Pamphilus must have been assisted by some rich Christian, as Origen was by Ambrose, if he had nothing of his own: but nothing of that kind is any where said by Eusebius or Jerom. On the contrary, it is all along supposed that he lived upon his own, and that from time to time he cheerfully laid out what he had, as occasions offered, in good works and useful designs of various kinds, as before seen.

So far as I can perceive, these Acts of Fabricius are much the same with those in Surius, Valesius, and others, as taken from Simeon Metaphrastes, which ^t were mentioned before: and therefore what I have said, or may say concerning either, ought to be understood as relating to both.

Fabricius supposeth these Acts to have been taken out of the books of Eusebius containing the life of Pamphilus. Valesius ^u thinks that those Acts in Metaphrastes were taken from Eusebius’s book of the Martyrs of Palestine: which book, as we now have it in the common copies, is imperfect, as he says, and may be made more complete by these Acts in Metaphrastes.

^p — seu secularium honorum ad quos adspirare poterat despicientiam. Vales.

^q — διαπεφας αὐτῆς τῆς κατὰ τὴν πολιτικῆς καὶ λειτεργίας. H. E. I. viii. p. 301, D.

^r — αποδομῶς γέται να εἰς αὐτὸν ἀπὸ προγενῶν κλητὰ γυναικας, ὧς καὶ σὺν ὅσῳ ἀπαντα, αὐτὸς ἐν ἀκτῆμοις διόχετο. — λ. Fabr. ib. p. 220. m. Renuntians quidem iis quæ ad ipsum

redibant a maioribus, nudis, nancis, et pauperibus distribuit. Ipse autem degerebat in vita quæ nihil possidebat. Ex Metaphrast. ap. Vales. ib. p. 180, b. in.

^s — τῇ τῆς ἐστίας εἰς ἐνδίας κοινῶν. De Mart. Pal. c. xi. p. 336, B.

^t See p. 337.

^u Vid. Vales. Ann.

p. 180.

P. 342.

I rather think these Acts to be the invention of some idle impostor, who, according to his own fancy, enlarged and flourished upon Eusebius's genuine account of the martyrdom of Pamphilus and his companions, which we have in the eleventh chapter of his book concerning the Martyrs of Palestine. The whole of this piece, compared with that chapter of Eusebius, has such an appearance: Eusebius says of that company of martyrs, that 'they resembled the prophet^a and apostles.' This writer^a adds, 'and the patriarchs.' Eusebius, speaking of their last combat, says, 'it^b was a most glorious spectacle;' as indeed it was. Whereupon this oratorical author says, 'there^c might be seen 'in it at once persons of every age of the human life, and of 'every rank in the church, (meaning^d faithful, catechumens, 'presbyters and deacons,) and of every condition and employment, and likewise a great variety of sufferings, and frequently different crowns for the victors.' This plan the author proposes at the beginning, and afterwards fills up as he sees good.

I think these considerations, added to the foregoing, may be sufficient to shew that this piece is a forgery.

The length of these critical remarks, I hope, will be excused. If we are not upon our guard, we shall have nothing but fable instead of history.

C H A P. LX.

PHILEAS, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt; and PHILOROMUS, receiver-general at Alexandria.

'PHILEAS, says^a Jerom, of a city in Egypt called Thmuis, 'of a noble family, and large estate, accepted an episcopal 'charge. He wrote an excellent book in praise of the martyrs. 'After a long debate with the judge, who commanded him to 'sacrifice, he was beheaded for Christ under the same persecutor, 'by whose orders Lucian suffered at Nicomedia.'

^a De M. Pal. c. xi p. 336, B.

^b Ap. Fab. ib. p. 219, m. ap. Valef. Ann. p. 179, C. ^c Ubi supr. p. 336, A.

^d ἁγίων καὶ αὐτῶν πατρὶς ἑκκλησιῶν τε σωμάτων, καὶ ψυχῶν ἀγωγῆς, βίῃ τε καὶ μαρτυρίᾳ διαφέρει περιμνησθῶτα, βασανῶν τε σποδῶν ἰδίων, κ. λ. ap. Fabr. p. 217, ap. Valef. 179, C. ^e Ap. Fabr. p. 219, in. ap. Valef. p. 180, A.

^e Phileas de urbe Ægypti, quæ vocatur Thmuis, nobili genere, et non parvis opibus, suscepto episcopatu elegantissimum librum de martyrum laude composuit. Et disputatione actorum habita adversus judicem, qui eum sacrificare cogebat, pro Christo capite truncatur, eodem in Ægypto persecutionis auctore, quo Lucianus Nicomedie. De V. I. c. 78.

Jerom

Jerom means the emperor Maximin. But learned men are not agreed about the year of this good man's martyrdom. By Cave ^a it is placed in 311, by ^c Basnage in 311 or 312, by ^d Tillemont after 306, and before the edict in 311 or 312. The place of his martyrdom is now, I think, generally allowed to be ^d Alexandria, though ^e Valesius once inclined to Thebais.

Phileas flourished, as Cave computes, near the end of the third century, about the year 296. It is likely that Thmuis was the place both of his nativity and his episcopate.

Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History has a long passage of a letter of Phileas to the Christians at Thmuis; which is generally reckoned to be the same that Jerom calls a book in Praise of the Martyrs.

Eusebius at the same time gives an account of the martyrdom of Philoromus. And there are still extant ^f Acts of the martyrdoms of these two persons, which are esteemed genuine and sincere by ^g Tillemont and ^h Ruinart: and indeed they are in the main agreeable to Eusebius: but yet it seems to me that they are interpolated: at least, I am of opinion that they are not to be relied upon as sincere and uncorrupt; for which reason I shall not make any use of them. But I shall immediately transcribe Eusebius's history of the death both of Phileas and Philoromus, with a part of the just-mentioned passage of the letter written by the former.

Our ecclesiastical historian then, having mentioned divers other instances of heroic courage and firmness of mind in the cause of truth, adds: 'And ⁱ these are indeed admirable: but yet more admirable are they who, distinguished by their wealth, high birth, honours, learning and eloquence, preferred before all other things true religion and faith in Jesus Christ. Among these was Philoromus, who bore no ordinary office, but was the emperor's receiver-general at Alexandria; and, as became his high station in the Roman government, daily heard causes, attended by a guard of soldiers. Phileas, likewise, bishop of the church at Thmuis, who had with reputation discharged all public offices in his own country, and was eminent for his philosophical learning, (when many of their kindred and other honourable friends, and some of the magistrates, and

^b H. L. in Philea. ^c Ann. 312, n. 18. ^d Mem. Ecc. S. Phileas, &c. T. v. P. iii. p. 173, et note 5.

^{dd} Vid. Basn. ib. n. 19. et Ruinart. Act. Mart. p. 494. ^e Annot. in Euseb. l. viii. c. 9.

^f Ap. Ruin. Act. M. p. 494—496. ^g As before, p. 163, &c.

^h Ubi supra, p. 493, 494.

ⁱ Θανμασιον μεν εν και ητοι εξαρεται ο εκεινος θανμασιωτερος, οι πλεον μεν και ευγενεια, και δοξην, λογω τε και φιλοσοφια διαπρεψαντες, κ. λ. Euseb. l. viii. c. 9. p. 301, C. D. 302.

‘ even the judge himself advised them to take pity upon themselves, and to consider their wives and children, would not by all their entreaties be induced, out of a regard to their own life, to transgress the divine laws concerning denying and confessing our Saviour; but with a manly and courageous and philosophic mind, or rather with a religious heart truly devoted to God, having withstood all the threatenings and abuses of the judge, they were both beheaded.

‘ But, ^k forasmuch as we said that Phileas was eminent for learning, let him be produced as his own witness. At the same time he shews what he himself was, he will relate the martyrdoms that happened in his time at Alexandria much more exactly than we can do. Thus then he writes in his epistle to the people at Thmuis:’ “ All ^l these ensamples and patterns and excellent admonitions being set before us in the divine and sacred scriptures, the blessed martyrs among us, without hesitation fixing the eye of their soul upon God over all, and willingly embracing death for the sake of religion, stedfastly adhered to their calling: knowing that ^m our Lord Jesus Christ became man for our sake, that he might destroy all sin, and afford us helps for obtaining eternal life: *For he did not earnestly desire to appear like God, but made himself of no reputation, taking the form of a servant: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself unto death, even the death of the cross:*” Philip. ii. 6, 7. “ Wherefore ⁿ also these martyrs, full of Christ, earnestly desiring (A) the greatest gifts, (1 Cor. xii. 31,) endured, not once only, but some of them often, all kinds of pains and tortures that can be invented; and, though the officers did their utmost by words and deeds to terrify them, they were not disheartened, *because perfect love casteth out fear:*” 1 John iv. 18.

I omit the rest which may be seen in Eusebius himself, who, having finished his extracts, adds: ‘ These ^o are the words of a true philosopher, and a martyr filled with the love of God: which, when in prison, before the final sentence of the judge, he sent to the people under his care; partly informing them

^k Ib. cap. 10, p. 332, B. &c.

^l Τῶν ἀπαιτῶν ὑποδείγματων ἡμῶν καὶ ὑπομνημάτων, καὶ καθὼν γνωρισμάτων ἐν ταῖς διχαῖς καὶ ἡραῖς γραφαῖς, κ. λ. ib. C.

^m — τὸν μὲν κυρίον ἡμῶν ἰσοῦν χριστὸν πρὸς ἐκδηρῶνται δι’ ἡμᾶς, ἵνα πάσαν ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐκκόψῃ, ἐφοδῶ δὲ τῆς εἰς τὴν αἰωνίαν ζωῆς ἐπιστῆναι κατὰ θέλησιν· ὃ γὰρ ἀγαθὸν κτήσαντο τοῦ εἶναι ἰσα δυν’ ἀλλ’

ἑαυτὸν ἐκείνῳ μορφῇ διδῶν λαβὼν. Ib. p. 302, C. D.

ⁿ Διὸ καὶ ζηλωσαντες τὰ μέγιστα χάρισματά οἱ χριστοφόροι μαρτυροῦν: ib. D. (A) St. Paul there says, the

best gifts, τὰ χάρισματά τὰ κρείττονα. But afterwards ch. xiii. 13, he says, The greatest of these is charity, μέγιστον δὲ τῶν ἡ ἀγάπη. • Ib. p. 304, B.

what were his own circumstances, partly exhorting them to 'hold fast the faith of Christ, even after his death, which was 'then near at hand.'

Here are, I think, three references to books of the New Testament; the first epistle to the Corinthians, and the epistle to the Philippians, and the first of St. John. We see by this short passage, what great regard the Christians of those times had for the holy scriptures; and how apt they were to clothe their own thoughts in expressions borrowed from them.

I suppose likewise, that none will dispute my interpretation of that phrase, which in our English translation is rendered, 'thought 'it not robbery to be equal with God;' for it is here evidently used and understood by Phileas, as expressive of our Lord's humility, not of his dignity and greatness. In the like manner have we already observed that expression understood by several (B) ancient Christian writers.

I would just observe that, at the end of the passage cited by Eusebius, Phileas quotes some precepts of the Old Testament, as ^P sacred scripture.

Phileas is elsewhere mentioned by ^a Eusebius among other bishops of Egypt, who suffered martyrdom in Dioclesian's persecution.

C H A P. LXI.

PETER, bishop of Alexandria, and the MELETIANS.

I. *Peter, his history and works, and testimony to the scriptures.* II. *The Meletians, their history and time.*

I. IN the year of our Lord 300, Peter succeeded Theonas at Alexandria. In St. Jerom's Chronicle ^a he is called the sixteenth bishop of that church, and is said to have had a glorious martyrdom in the ninth year of the persecution: but St. Jerom has not given this bishop of Alexandria a place in his Catalogue among other eminent writers of the church. Nor do I remember that

(n) See Vol. ii. chap. xxxviii. num. xxviii. 12. and in this Vol. p. 166, 241, 242, 321.

^P ἡρώδης γὰρ ταῦτο τῶν ἡρώδων ἡρώδης. Ib. p. 304, B.

^a I. viii. c. 13, p. 308, C. ^a Alexandrinae ecclesiae sextusdecimus post Theonam episcopus ordinatus Petrus, qui postea nono persecutionis anno gloriose martyrium perpetravit. Hieron. Chr. p. 179.

p. 351.

he has any where quoted him. However Peter is now generally reckoned an author. Several things are ascribed to him.

Penitential ^b Canons, supposed to ^c have been drawn up by him in the fourth year of the persecution under Dioclesian, in the year of Christ 306, for the sake of such as had some way lapsed under the severities they had endured, or through fear of suffering.

A work, entitled ^d De Divinitate, quoted in the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.

A Discourse ^e of Easter, which is not ^f allowed by all to be his.

Peter is several times mentioned by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History. It appears to me worth the while to transcribe all his passages; though some notice has been already taken of them at the beginning of the articles of Theonas and Pierius.

^g Theonas, ^h having borne the episcopal office nineteen years, was succeeded by Peter, who obtained great ^b honour during his episcopate, which he held twelve years. He governed the church three years before the persecution. The rest of his time he passed in a more strict and mortified course of life, but still without neglecting the common good of the churches; for which reason, in the ninth year of the persecution, he was beheaded, and obtained the crown of martyrdom.

In another place, giving an account of those presidents of the churches, who had demonstrated the sincerity of their faith by laying down their lives in the late persecution, he says: 'But ⁱ of those, who in Alexandria, and throughout Egypt and Thebais, gloriously finished their course, none more fit to be first mentioned than Peter, bishop of Alexandria, a ^k most excellent teacher of the Christian doctrine: and, among his presbyters, Faustus, Dius, and Ammonius, were perfect martyrs of Christ; as were also Phileas, Hefychius, Pachymius and Theodoros, bishops of divers churches in Egypt.'

Once more: 'About ^l the same time also Peter, who with so

^b Vid. Labbei Concil. T. i. p. 955—
668. ^c Scripsit quarto persecutionis
Diocletianæ anno, Christi 306, eorum
causa, qui in prædicta persecutione lapsi
essent, librum de Penitentia: ex quo su-
perant hodie canones 15, variis peniten-
tium casibus accommodati. Cav. H. L. in
Petro. ^d Alium item librum de Divini-
tate. Cav. ib. Vid. Labb. Concil. Tom.
ii. p. 286, C. D. E. ^e Scripsit etiam

tractatum de Paschate. Testantur id, quæ
habemus hodie hujus operis fragmenta.
Cav. ib. p. 160. ^f Vid. Cav. ut supra,
Basinag. Ann. 306, n. xiii. f.

^g Euf. H. E. l. vii. c. 32, p. 289, 290.
^h — ἐν τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ αὐτὸς διαπρεφὴς
ἐφ' ὅλοις δυσκαλῶν ἐπιστολαῖς. Ib. p. 289, D.

ⁱ Ib. l. viii. c. 13, p. 308, B. C.

^k Διὸν τὸ ἄξιμα διδασκαλῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας
θεοσεβείας. ibid. ^l Ib. l. ix. c. 6.

‘much reputation presided over the church at Alexandria, an^m ornament to the episcopal character, both for the holiness of his life and his laborious application in studying and explaining the sacred scriptures, without any crime of any kind laid to his charge, beyond all expectation, on a sudden, for no other reason but the will of Maximin, was taken up and beheaded.’

Our bishop is several times mentioned and called martyr byⁿ St. Athanasius. I shall take notice of two places. In one of them he observes: ‘Peter^o was bishop here before the persecution, and in the persecution was also a martyr.’ In the other he intimates, that Peter suffered at the end of the persecution, or even after it was over, as his manner of writing may be thought to imply. Which too seems to be agreeable to what Eusebius said just now of Peter’s having been arrested and beheaded on a sudden, and beyond all expectation. The words of Athanasius are these: ‘But^p when the persecution had ceased, and the blessed bishop Peter had suffered martyrdom, Antony removed, and returned to his monastery.’

Sozomen says that^q Peter fled in the time of the persecution: I suppose he must mean some retirement, which was free from blame. Sozomen himself does not pass any censure upon it: and Eusebius has represented Peter’s episcopate as so illustrious, and every way worthy of commendation, that it is not easy to admit the suspicion of any improper conduct. However, that expression of Sozomen, and what Eusebius says of Peter’s strict course of life, though without at all neglecting the care of the churches, may lead us to think that, for a large part of the persecution, he lived in some private place unknown to the instruments of the persecution; where however Christian people had access to him, and received his advices and instructions.

Theodoret styles Peter^r a most excellent person, and a victorious combatant, who in the time of wicked tyrants obtained the crown of martyrdom. Again, he calls him^s divine Peter.

I do not intend to make any long extracts out of Peter’s book of Canons, or Canonical Epistle, the only piece of his that remains, if indeed it be his. I would however observe, that he

^m Θειον επισκοπων χρημα, εις αρετης τε ευεκα, και της των ημων λογων σπουδης, κ. λ. ib. p. 351, C.

ⁿ Apol. contr. Arian. n. xi. p. 133, D. Ep. ad Episc. Æg. et Lib. n. 23.

^o Apol. contr. Arian. n. 59.

^p Επειδη δε λοιπον ο διωγμος επαυσατο, και μεταστρεφεις ο μακαριτης επισκοπος

πιτρος, απηδημησεν, κ. λ. Vit. S. Anton. n. 47.

^q — Φευγοντος δια του του διωγμου. Soz. l. i. c. 24.

^r — μετα πικρον εκεινον τον μικρονον αγωνιστη, ος εκ των δυσσεβων εκεινων τυραννων το μαρτυριον σεβασιον ανεδεικνυτο. Thdrt. l. i. c. 2, p. 7.

^s το σεβαστον πειτρον, κ. λ. Id. l. i. c. 9. in.

p. 356.

resolves all his cases by the authority of the holy scriptures: and that here are cited the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; the Acts of the apostles, very largely; several epistles of Paul, particularly that to the Hebrews, as ^t the apostle's, intending Paul; and the first epistle of John. In the fragment of his book *De Divinitate* are cited ^u the beginning of John's gospel, several epistles of Paul, and the first of Peter.

II. In the time of Peter arose the Meletian controversy, or schism, as it is usually called; which, as ^x Tillemont observes, subsisted for the space of an hundred and fifty years, not being extinct in the time of Theodoret and Socrates.

I do not reckon myself obliged to give a particular history of that affair; but I beg liberty to say that I cannot easily assent to Athanasius's account of the rise and occasion of it, which is to this purpose: 'Peter ^y in a full synod of bishops deposed Meletius, an Egyptian bishop; who was convicted of several crimes, and particularly of having sacrificed. Meletius neither appealed to another synod, nor took any pains to vindicate himself, but presently made a schism. And to this day ^z his followers, instead of Christians, are called Meletians. From that time Meletius took great liberties in calumniating Peter, and then Achilles.'

There are several considerations tending to weaken the credit of this account: 1. Athanasius is a prejudiced person. After the council of Nice, if not before, the Meletians ^a joined interests with the Arians; and certainly they were always enemies to the bishop of Alexandria. 2. Athanasius writes with passion. Meletius, he says, was convicted of many crimes; but he does not name them: he only mentions sacrificing. Nor is it likely that the Meletians quitted the name of Christians. They were often called Meletians by others, and sometimes possibly by themselves: but to say that instead of Christians they were called Meletians is invidious. How unreasonable is this in Athanasius, when Meletius and his followers at first, and for a good while, if not all along, agreed with him in every point of doctrine! Epiphanius ^b, to whom ^c others assent, expressly

¹ — εἰμὴν, ὡς λέγει ἀπολογος, ἐπιστολῆς
² οὐ τῆς ἀντιχριστιανικῆς οὐχίας. [Hebr. xi.
32] Can ix. ap. Labb. T. i. p. 962.

³ Ap. Labb. Conc. T. iv. p. 468, C.
D. E. ^x St. Pierre d'Alexandrie. art.
8. Mem. Ec. T. v. P. iii. p. 111.

^y Οὗτος Μελετίος, ἀπὸ τῆς αἰγυπτιακῆς λεγο-
μένης ἐπισκοπῆς, ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἐλεγχεῖντα
παρεκρίματι; καὶ θύσι; ἐν κοινῇ συνόδῳ τῶν

ἐπισκοπῶν καθέλει, κ. λ. Athan. ap. contr.
Arian. n. 97, T. i. p. 177.

^z Καὶ αὐτὶ χριστιανῶν, μελετιανοὶ μέχρι τοῦ
οὐ τῆς ἐκείνης μερίδος ἀπομαρτυροῦνται. ibid.

^a Vid. Socrat. H. E. l. i. c. 6, p. 14,
Sozom. l. ii. c. 21.

^b Σχίσμα ἐποίησεν;
ὡς μετὰ λαχνοῦς τῆς πίστεως γέγονενταί.
Epiph. H. 68, n. i. Vid. ib. reliqua.

^c Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὴ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ φέρων.
Theodoret.

precisely says that Meletius made a schism, but attempted not any innovation in the faith. Nor does (A) Athanasius differ from them. 3. If Meletius had been convicted of apostasy, or of sacrificing to idols in time of persecution, the sentence passed upon him and his adherents in the council of Nice would have been different. What it was may be seen in several ^d ancient writers of ecclesiastical history. 4. Meletius ^e always complained of injustice. 5. And moreover ^f he had a numerous party on his side, no less than ^g eight-and-twenty bishops, and many good men: which could not have been, if he had been known to have fallen so greatly in the time of the persecution. 6. There are other accounts, and Athanasius is almost singular. Socrates ^h indeed speaks to the like purpose, because he transcribes Athanasius: but, according to Epiphanius, Meletius ⁱ was a confessor: and the controversy between the bishop of Lycopolis in Thebais and the bishop of Alexandria was owing to their different sentiments concerning the manner of receiving such as had lapsed in the persecution, Peter ^k being more mild and merciful than Meletius. Sozomen makes the fault of Meletius to have been this; that, ^l when Peter had fled, Meletius usurped a power of ordaining where he had no right: nor is there any thing laid to his charge by the council of Nice, as the ground and reason of their sentence, but ^m the rashness and presumption of his ordinations, and the obstinacy and contumacy of him and his adherents in maintaining them. Theodoret indeed does in one place say, following Athanasius, it is likely that ⁿ Meletius was convicted of some crimes: but he does not seem to know what they were, nor to have any good assurance of the facts. And, in another place, speaking of Meletius, all he lays to his charge is ambition, or love of dominion, ^o in ordaining bishops

Theodoret. H. F. l. iv. c. 7. p. 239. Ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ μετ' αὐτῶν τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας δογματικῶν ἀκρίβητος. Id. ib. p. 240.

(A) This appears, in that Athanasius calls the Arians heretics, the Meletians schismatics only, and thus distinguisheth their several crimes. Ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν πρὸς τὴν ἑκκλησίαν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοῦ σχισματικῶν ἡρώων οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποδοχῆς, οἱ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἔστιν ἀποδοχῆς ἀρετῆς. κ. λ. Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib. n. 22, T. i. p. 293.

^d Vid. Socr. l. i. c. 9. Sozom. l. i. c. 24. Thdr. H. F. l. iv. c. 7.

^e Ἰδὲ ὁμοῦ μετ' αὐτῶν κ. λ. Socr. l. i. c. 6, p. 14. C. Conf. Thdr. l. i. c. 9, in.

^f Vid. Epiph. ii. 63, n. 2, 3, et 5.

^g Vid. Athan. ap. contr. Arian. n. 71, p. 187.

^h Socr. ubi sup. p. 14. B. Vid. not. c.

ⁱ Epiph. ib. n. 1, 2. ^k Οὐ ἀγνοῦντες

πετρεὺς εὐσπλαγχνὸς ὢν, κ. λ. Epiph. ib. n. 3, in. ^l ———— πετρεὺς ———— φευκτὸς διὰ τὸν διαγμὸν, τὰς διαφθίνας αὐτῶν χειροτονίας ἐφύρασε. Sozom. l. i. c. 24.

^m Ἐκείνῳ δὲ τὸ κατὰ τὴν προτίμησιν ἡλίκῳ, καὶ τὰν αὐτῶν χειροτονημάτων. αρ. Socr. l. i. c. 9, p. 28. ———— λογιζομὴν τὸ προτίμησιν καὶ εἰσὶν ἐν χειροτονίας μετὰ, καὶ τὰν αὐτῶν δογματικῶν. Sozom. ubi supra. Vid. et Thdr. l. i. c. 9.

ⁿ ———— ἐπὶ τῇς παρανομίας διελθόν, κ. λ. Thdr. l. i. c. 9, in.

^o Meletius τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς κατὰ τῆς ἀδείας τῇ μεγάλῃ σαλίσσῃ κερμαίνε, πολλὰς πόδας καὶ ἐπισκοπῆς χειροτονῶν, καὶ πρεσβυτέρους, καὶ ———— αἱρετικῶν προσηλαῖν, ἀλλὰ τὰν αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν φρονεῖ. τὸ δὲ τῆς φιλίας ἐκδοχῆς παύει. Id. H. Fab. l. iv. c. 7.

p. 361.

and other clergy out of his own province, where he had no jurisdiction.

Upon the whole, I think there is not sufficient ground to admit the truth of what Athanasius says of Meletius's sacrificing. It is more likely that it is a story forged by some angry people with a view to discredit the Meletian cause; which story Athanasius too readily received.

Samuel Basnage, of Flottemanville, in his Exercitations published in 1692, disputes ^p the truth of that account: but in his annals, published in 1706, he writes ^q as if he had quite forgot what he had once said; which needs not, however, to be reckoned very strange in an author who writes a great deal.

In composing the argument here offered, I have had no regard to that in Basnage's Exercitations, which I did not observe till afterwards. These thoughts arose in my mind in reading Athanasius, and comparing him with other ancient writers.

It is disputed among learned men when this schism began. Baronius ^r placeth it in 306: Basnage ^s in his Annals, before cited, contends for the same date: Pagi is altogether ^t for 301, or 302: Tillemont ^u carefully examines the merits of each opinion without determining the point.

It seems to me, that all the accounts and testimonies above cited, which speak of this controversy, as arising in the time of Peter, and after the beginning of the persecution, should lead us to pitch upon the year 306, or thereabout: when Peter, as is supposed, put out his Canons, and, as is likely, began to live more retired than he had done; then, probably, Meletius began to ordain bishops, and other clergy, where he should not.

The only thing that leads to the year 300, or 301, or 302, is a passage of Athanasius in a piece supposed to have been written in ^v 256; where he says that ^w the Meletians had been schismatics above five-and-fifty years. Upon which I would observe, that possibly the numbers in Athanasius have been altered; or he

^p Hoc affirmat Athanasius, — tantique testis auctoritas apud me plurimum valet.

— Veruntamen nonnullas de Meletii idololatria dubitandi causas suggerunt Theodoretus, Epiphanius, Nicæna Synodus. — Hæc sunt quæ de Meletiana idololatria suspensum detinent. — Basn. Exercit. p. 307, 308. Ultraj. 1692.

^q Vera prædicasse Socratem, testis est omni exceptione maior Athanasius. — At falso contaminari Epiphaniï narrationem extra dubium est. Cum enim Epiphanius antiquior, et rerum Ægypti, ubi scilicet Meletianum exortum est, longe prætor Athanasius scriptum reliquit, Meletianum idolis sacrificasse, fide quoque dig-

nior est. Basn. Ann. Pol. Ec. A. 206, n. 14. Roterod. 1706.

^r Baron. Ann.

306, n. 44.

^s Basn. Ann. 306, n. 15.

^t Ann. 306, n. 29, 30.

^u Mem. Ec. S. Pierre d'A. art. 8, et not. 8, T. v. P. iii. p. 111,

et 301. ^v Vid. Athanas. Opp. Ed. Bened. T. i. p. 177, not. c. et p. 269.

^w ἢ γὰρ ὀλίγος ἔστιν ὁ χρόνος ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν πρὸ τριηκοντα καὶ πέντε ἔτων σχισματικοὶ γέγονασιν· οἱ δὲ πρὸ τριακοντα καὶ ἑξ ἔτων ἀπεδείχθησαν αἱρετικοί, καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπέβλησαν ἐκ κρείττους πάσης τῆς οὐκ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς συνοδῆς. Ep. ad Episc. Æg. et Lib. n. 22, p. 293.

might write in haste, and mistake through forgetfulness: or, finally, it is not impossible that, for some reason or other affecting his mind at that time, he might chuse to ascribe a very early date to that schism. I add, that in the same place Athanasius says, ‘It^z was six-and-thirty years since the Arians were declared heretics, and cast out of the church by the judgment of an œcumenical council.’ Which might induce us to think that piece must have been written in the year 361 or 362, that is, six-and-thirty years after the council of Nice, when the Arians were condemned; if there were not some cogent reasons shewing that epistle to have been written in 356: and, notwithstanding what the Benedictine editors say, it is more reasonable to carry on the number, thirty-six, through the whole sentence, than to confine it to the first part of it, *declared heretics*, and to understand thereby some declaration, different from that of the council there spoken of. I do not therefore see any good reason why this passage of Athanasius should oblige us to think the Meletian controversy arose before the year 306.

^z See note 7. ^a Verum hunc locum par est ita distinguere, ut verbum, *ἀπαρ-
ίστησαν*, sunt declarati, ad Alexandrum
Alexandrinum referantur, qui nimirum in Synodo Alexandrina Arium hæreticum
primus declaravit; cætera autem quæ se-
quuntur, Nicenæ attribuantur Synodo,
Ubi supr. p. 269, n. 4.

AN ANSWER to Mr. JACKSON's Remarks upon the fifth volume of the first edition of this work.

See the Belief of a future State proved to be a fundamental Article of the Religion of the Hebrews, p. 120, &c.

I. *The time of Sabellianism.* II. *The name of the presbyter of Rome, rival of Cornelius: whether Novatus or Novatianus.*

I. MR. JACKSON is not a little displeased at my placing the rise of Sabellianism so late as only two or three years before A. D. 257, when Dionysius of Alexandria wrote to pope Xystus upon that subject: though I am not therein singular, but only maintain the general opinion of learned men about it, as I shewed p. 72. To authors there mentioned I shall add one or two more: Hæresis Sabelliana erupit circa A. C. 257. *f. A. Fabr. Annot. ad Philast. cap. liv. de Sabellio.* Sabellius, Eusebio teste lib. 7. Hist. cap. vi. errores Ptolemaide in urbe Pentapoleos circiter annum 257, spargere cœpit. *Benedictin. not. ad Ambros. Tom. ii. p. 445.* Scribit Eusebius lib. Ecc. Hist. 7. Sabellii hæresim sub tempora Decii —audiri cœpisse, cum Romanæ sedi præesset Stephanus, aut Sixtus: hoc est, circa annum Christi cclvii. &c. *Petav. Dogm. Theol. Tom. ii. l. i. c. 6, §. iii.*

I do not think myself obliged to say a great deal more here in vindication of that date: I can rely upon my argument from Dionysius, exhibited p. 234, 235; and I persuade myself that they, who will read it and carefully attend to it, will not think that Mr. Jackson has weakened it by what he has said, but has left it still in full force.

Mr. Jackson says, p. 121, that 'Dionysius, in his letter to Xystus, gives no account of the rise of Sabellianism, but only of it's being greatly spread.' But my argument does not depend upon that, but rather upon Dionysius's not having sooner sent an account of that affair to his correspondents at Rome; which he would have done if the controversy had been on foot a good while before: nevertheless, it happens that there are expressions in that letter of Dionysius which imply that it was then but newly moved, advanced, or agitated. *Περὶ τῆς τῶν κληρικῶν ἐν τῇ ὁτολμαίᾳ τῆς ὁρισταπλευρῆς δογματικῆς.* *Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. viii. c. 6.*

Besides, what avails it for Mr. Jackson to insist so much upon it, that Dionysius gives Xystus an account of the *increase*, not of the *rise* of Sabellianism, when the increase supposes the rise? And it is the spreading of a doctrine that induces men to take notice of it, and send accounts of it to their friends. If Sabellianism had not spread in the country near him, Dionysius would not have thought it needful to make any mention of it in a letter to one at a distance: this therefore was what he was naturally lead to speak of in his letter to Xystus.

Farther, Mr. Jackson says, p. 122, 123, 'Sabellius himself was undoubtedly noted many years before; and, upon the death of his master Noetus, about A. D. 220, spread his doctrine in several parts of Asia: p. 24. Sabellius was the most noted—the most famous disciple of Noetus.'

These things are said with a good deal of positiveness: but upon what grounds? where is the evidence? *Tillemont Mem. Ec. T. iv. Les Sabelliens*, observes: 'Philaster and Augustine say that Sabellius was a disciple of Noetus, which is not impossible, though the Greeks say nothing of it.' Philaster's words are: Sabellius post illum [Noetum] de Libya discipulus ejus similitudinem sui doctoris itidem secutus est et errorem. Augustine's words are: Sabelliani ab illo Noeto, quem supra memoravimus, defluxisse dicuntur. Nam et discipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium: so that he speaks doubtfully about it. Many might call Sabellius a disciple of Noetus, as he came not very long after him, and because of the resemblance of their opinions: but if it was a thing well known that Sabellius was a scholar of Noetus, why should the Greeks omit to mention it? And if they write nothing about it, how should the Latins know it? The silence of Greek authors is of much more importance than the sayings and reports of a few Latin writers. Had not Epiphanius and Theodoret, who write of heresies, and particularly of Noetianism and Sabellianism, an opportunity to say where Sabellius learned his doctrine if they knew it? Theodoret, *H. F. l. iii. c. 3*, mentions some predecessors of Noetus, and says that Callistus upheld his opinion after him: *ταύτης μετὰ τὸν τοιοῦτον ὑπερησκήσας*. But says nothing here or elsewhere, that I remember, of Sabellius being a disciple of Noetus. Epiphanius, *H. 62, n. 1*, says that Sabellius's doctrine was the same with that of the Noetians, except-

'ing only a few things.' Why does he not add that Sabellius learned his doctrine from Noetus, if he knew that also to be true?

Mr. Jackson says, p. 121, 'There is no evidence that Sabellianism had it's rise in Ptolemais in Egypt.' Where then had it it's rise? It is generally concluded by learned men, from Eusebius's account of Dionysius's letter to Xystus, that it had it's rise in Ptolemais. Sabellius himself is continually spoken of by the ancients, who give an account of him and his doctrine as a Libyan or African: so Philaster before cited; and so Theodoret, *H. F. l. ii. c. 9.* *Σαβελλιος δὲ ὁ Λιβυὸς ὁ Πτολεμαῖος.* If Sabellianism had it's rise in Asia Minor, at Ephesus, or Smyrna, or thereabout, why have we no account of any writers of that country opposing it? Athanasius says that in the time of Dionysius some of the bishops of Pentapolis held the doctrine of Sabellius, which occasioned his looking into the matter. *Εἰς πενταπόλιν τῆς αὐτοῦ Λιβύης τῆς τότε τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν ἐφρονιστὸν τὰ σαβελλιανῶν.* *De Sent. Dionys. n. 5, p. 246.* And Theodoret, in his article of Sabellius, takes particular notice that Dionysius of Alexandria wrote against him. If this principle had been first taught by Sabellius in some other parts before it was known in Egypt, why does not Dionysius himself; why did not Eusebius, nor Athanasius, nor Epiphanius, nor Theodoret, give any hint of it?

Mr. Jackson, p. 125, still insists upon 'the authority of two ancient chronologers, Isidore Hispalensis, and Ado Viennensis, who in their chronicles agree to place Sabellius about A. D. 220.' And indeed he had need to call them *ancient*. Nevertheless Mr. Jackson does not deny the truth of what I said, p. 235, that they are Latin authors; 'and that they wrote, one of them in Spain in the seventh, the other 'in Gaul, in the ninth century:' that is, the earliest of them several hundred years after the supposed time of Sabellius. The authority of such chroniclers undoubtedly is very great. I likewise argued from several considerations, to which the reader is referred, that they centounded Noetus and Sabellius.

But Mr. Jackson's strongest argument seems to be, that his author could not write his *excellent* book on the Trinity, p. 126, his *incomparable and invaluable* book, p. 132, after his schism; which yet he must have done if Sabellianism had not it's rise till after 251. Nec, quantum cogito, verisimile est, illum condidisse tam egregium librum,—postquam in schisma detestandum se demersisset. *Præf. p. 18.* But the force of this argument depends upon a degree of uncharitableness in a man's mind, for which I can see no ground: a heretic, or schismatic, we may suppose, cannot write a good book in favour of his errors, or wrong conduct: but if he hold any truths in common with other men, I do not see why he may not be able to write well in defence of them: and I readily assent to Nicephorus in what he says of Eusebius, the famous bishop of Cæsarea; that he left many writings useful for the church, though he often favours Arianism. *Καὶ ἀλλὰ διαφερα συγγραμμάτων καὶ ἀκεραῖες, πολλὰν ὠφελίαν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐισφάροντα· πολλὴν τοῖς τοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐκείνῃ τὰ ἀρετὰς ὡς ἐξέλεον.* *Nic. H. E. l. vi. c. 37, p. 446, c.*

I have here added thus much concerning the time of Sabellius, to please Mr. Jackson; though I am of opinion that what I said formerly was sufficient.

II. I must take some notice of what Mr. Jackson says concerning the name of Novatus, otherwise called Novatianus.

I offered five arguments; the first of which was, that 'this presbyter of Rome is generally called Novatus by the Greek writers.' This argument I did not much labour, because I supposed it to be allowed by learned moderns, that the Greek authors do generally to write his name. However, Mr. Jackson affirms, p. 131, that 'my opinion is contrary to the testimony of the most ancient Greek, as well as Latin writers.' Let us then see how Mr. Jackson shews this.

He allows, p. 126, that 'Eusebius generally calls him Novatus; and the historian Socrates likewise after Eusebius.' But why does he say after Eusebius? Doubtless Socrates had read Eusebius: but was he not also well acquainted with many of the Novatians at Constantinople? And had they not there divers learned men, who could inform him in the history of their founder?

At p. 126, Mr. Jackson says that 'though Eusebius himself calls him Novatus, he has preserved his true name in the seventh book of his Ecclesiastical History, and eighth chapter; where he is called Novatian in the letter which his contemporary, Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, wrote concerning his schism to his namesake of Rome.' But I should think that Mr. Jackson might be reasonably led to conclude that must be a wrong reading, even though it should be allowed to be ancient. For the title of that chapter is, 'Of the Herefy of Novatus;' and at the end of the preceding chapter Eusebius, introducing that letter to Dionysius of Rome, says that 'in it Dionysius of Alexandria writes concerning Novatus after this manner.' Γραφει δε ες τον αδελφον των κατων τον νοβατον μηνωνουσιν εν τωτοις. And in the 43d chapter of the sixth book of his Ecclesiastical History, giving an account of the affair at Rome, both Eusebius and Cornelius himself, in his letter to Fabius, often mention the Roman presbyter by the name Novatus: it must therefore be probable that in one place an error has crept in contrary to the original reading: accordingly, in the Latin translation of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, printed at Basil in 1611, or 1612, is *Novatus*; the translator, I suppose, taking it for granted that the other was a wrong reading: *Novato quidem merito succensimus.* Moreover, in the 45th chapter of the same sixth book of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, is a letter of Dionysius to the presbyter of Rome himself, where he calls him *Novatus*: Διονυσιος νοβατω τον αδελφον ημετον. Indeed as that letter is given by Niceph. l. vi. c. 4, it has *Novatianus*; but surely Eusebius's authority is better than that of so late a writer, if indeed we have his authority for it: but probably that reading did not come from Nicephorus himself; for he too, as well as other Greek authors, writes his name *Novatus*. *Vid. Niceph. l. vi. c. 3, T. i. p. 397. A. cap. 5, p. 394, c. 6, p. 395, et 396, c. 7, p. 397, B. &c. d. cap. 35, p. 436, C. Καὶ σοκράτης ο εκ ναυατυ.* — And, even introducing Dionysius's letter to Novatus, where we now have *Novatian*, Nicephorus says, 'that letter was written to Novatus.' Οποια δε και αυτο εκεινη εστιν τον ει ρωμην εκκλησιαν διασταλθεντι γρηγορε, παρθεσθαι δικαιον, L. 6. c. 4. p. 393. D. Inasmuch that, though in the Greek copies of Nicephorus's *Historia*, the Latin translator, sensible it must be a wrong reading,

puts

puts *Novatus*: Dionysius Novato fratri salutem: and so it is likewise in Rufinus's ancient Latin translation of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, as was shewn formerly: see p. 249.

I hope I have now at once shewn that Dionysius of Alexandria, and Nicephorus, as well as Eusebius, write the name of the presbyter of Rome, *Novatus*.

Still Mr. Jackson says, p. 127, that 'in the Chronography of Georgius Syncellus, p. 374, Dionysius calls the Roman presbyter to whom he wrote Novatian.' But then in the margin is put *Novatus*, as a various reading, or a correction of the text, as supposed to be corrupt, and with good reason; for elsewhere very often, perhaps forty or fifty times, that author writes *Novatus*.

Mr. Jackson says, p. 127, 'And Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History, l. iii. c. 8. calls the Roman presbyter Novatian, and so expressly against Mr. L——, though he has alleged him on his side.' But let any attentive person judge whether Mr. Jackson has reason for what he says here: in that place indeed Sozomen has *Novatian*; but in another *Novatus*. Μαδων γαρ, μακεδονιος της παλεις ενδαε τα ναυατα φρενι. κ. λ. l. iv. c. 21, p. 571, D. And in another place he expressly says that the name of the leader of the sect was *Novatus*. Ναυατος μεν γαρ, ος αρχητης ηναιε της αιρεσεως. κ. λ. l. vi. c. 24, p. 670. A. It is likely therefore that, in the place referred to by Mr. Jackson, we have a wrong reading; for it is not reasonable to think that in that one place Sozomen intended to contradict himself, or that he used a different writing of the name from Eusebius and Socrates: but, however that be, should not the other places have been taken notice of by Mr. Jackson? Was Mr. Jackson in the right to conceal them from his readers? And was not I in the right to reckon Sozomen on my side, when he has left at least two places to one for me?

At p. 249, I mentioned Athanasius among other Greek authors writing *Novatus*. And certainly he is an ancient author: nor does Mr. Jackson attempt to weaken his testimony: I referred to but one passage in Athanasius; but I might have referred to others; and he is a good witness, having lived some while in the west: and that he means the presbyter of Rome is apparent. Vid. Ap. cont. Arian. n. 25, p. 144, E. F. Vid. et Ep. iv. ad Serap. n. 13 p. 704. E. The author of the Paschal Chronicle, giving the history of Dionysius of Alexandria and the Roman presbyter, calls him *Novatus* several times. Εν ος αριεος νωτορεαυατος της ρωμαιων εκκλησιας πρεσβυτερος ελεγεν. κ. λ. p. 271, C. vid. ib. D. et p. 272. A. Theodoret expressly makes *Novatus* presbyter of Rome author of the sect. Ο δε ναυατος ρωμαιων της εκκλησιας πρεσβυτερος ην. H. Fab. l. iii. cap. 5. and I might allege Philostorgius, Epiphanius, Zonaras, and other Greek authors, writing the name after the same manner: but I forbear. If I have set Mr. Jackson's readers right as to Dionysius of Alexandria, and Sozomen, I have performed all that was needful for repairing my first argument.

My second argument, p. 249, 250, was, 'that there are still remaining in Latin authors traces of their agreement with the Greek writers upon this head.' I allow that some ancient writers did, though corruptly, write the Roman presbyter's name *Novatian*: but I think that many

many others write it Novatus; of which we still have traces in the works of divers of them: but I am of opinion that in several passages the right reading has been altered; which has been owing to a notion, prevailing of late among moderns, that his name was Novatian.

Under that argument I produced passages of divers ancient Latin authors: one of those passages is from Hilary, at p. 249. which Mr. Jackson does not contest, because, as I suppose, he is sensible the Roman presbyter must be meant: other passages are from Jerom, Philaster, Augustine: these Mr. Jackson disputes; for he says those writers do not mean the presbyter of Rome, but the presbyter of Carthage. I argued that by Novatus Jerom must mean the Roman presbyter in several places of his works, because he speaks of him as an author; whereas Novatus of Carthage never was reckoned an author. In answer to this Mr. Jackson says, p. 129, that 'Jerom certainly meant Novatus of Carthage in all the places referred to by me; and that this Novatus he supposes to have been a writer in his 56th epistle to Tranquillinus, p. 589.' But I am apt to think that most readers, who look upon those passages of Jerom, will be of a different mind, and think that probably Jerom means the Roman presbyter. Mr. Jackson has no reason for saying that he 'certainly meant the presbyter of Carthage:' nor can I see that Jerom, in the epistle referred to by Mr. Jackson, supposes Novatus to have been an author: I think he means the Roman presbyter, Mr. Jackson's author. The words are: Ego Origenem propter eruditionem sic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum, Novatum, Arnobium.—But who ever heard of the writings or the learning of Novatus of Carthage?

Some may make a doubt whether Philaster and Augustine, when they say the Novatians were so called from Novatus, mean the presbyter of Carthage or him of Rome: but it seems to me most likely that they mean the latter, who was by much the more famous man: nor can there be any good reason assigned why they should not there mean the same person, even the presbyter of Rome, to whom their brethren, the Greek writers continually ascribe the unmerciful doctrine of rejecting penitents; to whom likewise the Latins themselves ascribe it very frequently: and I suppose it to be a common opinion, among learned and judicious moderns, that the party was not denominated from the presbyter of Carthage, but from the presbyter of Rome. Nefandæ seditioni tamen Novatianus, non Novatus nomen imposuit. *Basnag. An.* 251. n. vi. Indeed Jerom says: Hujus auctor Novatus Cypriani presbyter fuit: which I have translated: 'The first author of this rigid principle was Novatus, Cyprian's presbyter,' p. 207. And Mr. Jackson, p. 128, translates it after this manner: 'The author of this sect was Novatus, one of Cyprian's presbyter's.' But I think that we have neither of us translated very happily; for that sense does not agree with the preceding words, where Jerom expressly says that Novatian, or Novatus of Rome, formed or constituted the sect of the Novatians. Novatianus Romanæ urbis presbyter, adversus Cornelium cathedram sacerdotalem conatus invadere Novatianum—dogma constituit, nolens apostasias suscipere poenitentes. Hujus auctor Novatus Cypriani presbyter fuit. It seems to me therefore that in these last words Je-
rom

rom intends to say, 'his adviser was Novatus, one of Cyprian's presbyters:' for, having before said that 'the presbyter of Rome formed the sect of the Novatians,' he cannot be supposed to say, presently afterwards, that Novatus of Carthage was the author of the same sect. The most, I think, that he can mean is, that the presbyter of Carthage helped and concurred with him at Rome: and this too it is likely is said by him upon the authority of St. Cyprian only. Moreover, it is observable that Novatus, the presbyter of Carthage, so long at least as he was in Africa, was of a quite contrary principle from that which distinguished the Novatian sect: he was for receiving those who had lapsed upon very easy terms; and though he may afterwards have embraced the rigid principle of that sect, yet it is not likely that he should have been the first author and proposer of it. I shall represent this in the words of some others, that it may not be suspected I state the case wrong. *Secundum Baronii argumentum pariter infirmum, quod nempe cum daz essent inter se contrariæ sectæ schismaticorum, Felicissimus ille sententiæ Novati adversarius erat, quod diceret, lapsos omnes absque pœnitentiæ mora recipiendos. Nam hæc nihil probant. Quippe Novatus, quamdiu in Africa fuit, semper se ejusdem cum Felicissimo sententiæ de lapsis recipiendis professus est. Cum autem Romam venisset, et se Novatiano adjunxisset, ut Romanum schisma promoveret, illius sententiam amplexus esse videbatur, sive serio, sive fide, ut et ipse Novatianus sententiam suam jam mutaverat, ut Cornelio fortius contradiceret. Pagi in Baron. A. D. 250, n. xiv. Vid. et Basnag. Ann. P. E. 371. n. v. Qua quidem in re a nonnullis in duo peccatum est extrema. Nam, Carthagine, Felicissimus, cui Novatus se adjunxit, lapsos omnes absque ulla mora recipiendos dixit. Contra, Romæ, Novatianus, ad quem et postea Novatus, mutatis partibus, accessit, lapsos nunquam recipi voluit. Turretin. Hist. Ec. Compend, p. 23. Novatus Carthagine, absente Cypriano, cum lapsis communicaverat—Paulo post Romam veniens Novatus simile inter Cornelium episcopum et Novatianum dissidium invenit, ex nimia Cornelii in lapsos indulgentia natum, et eousque excrefcens, ut Novatianus a factiosis episcopus crearetur. Hic Novatum in aliud extremum pertraxit, suisque partibus junxit, quæ Catharorum, seu purorum superbivere nomine. Lampe Synopf. Hist. Ec. p. 120. And here I think it would not be amiss for my readers to recollect what I said formerly, p. 222, 223, shewing that Cyprian beyond measure magnified the influence of his presbyter Novatus in the disturbances at Rome, and that Cyprian has been too much relied on by some.*

My third argument was, 'The common appellation of this people shews that the name of their leader was Novatus, not Novatianus.' For they are generally called Novatians. If the name of their leader had been Novatianus, they would have been called *Novatianenses*, or somewhat like it; whereas there is but one instance of this, which is in Cyprian, and is cited from him by Augustine. I took notice of it, p. 250; nor has Mr. Jackson produced any other instance: he has therefore left this argument in it's full force.

The fourth argument was, 'that there never was, that we know of, any one, in any age, called Novatian, unless the person in dispute

was

'was so named.' This argument Mr. Jackson has not touched, having no instance to allege; whilst Novatus is no uncommon name as I shewed. This argument must be of considerable weight in a point of this kind; for it is not likely that this famous presbyter of Rome should be called by a name which no other man ever had, neither before him nor after him. Indeed this argument alone appears to me decisive, unless there is some clear evidence of another kind against it, which there is not.

In the fifth place I observed that some 'learned moderns seem to have supposed the name of this person to be Novatus.' And I referred to some, p. 252; to them ought to be added the author of the Roman edition of St. Ambrose's works, spoken of p. 249. The learned lawyer, Fr. Balduinus, likewise was of the same opinion: *Ecclesiæ Romanæ presbyter Novatus, et Antiochenæ episcopus Paulus Samosatensis, magnas paulo ante turbas dederant. De Leg. C. M. l. i. p. 48. Vid. et ib. p. 65, m.*

I accounted for Cyprian's manner of writing this person's name, p. 252, and shall add nothing more here.

Upon the whole it still appears to me highly probable that *Novatus* was the name of the presbyter of Rome, Cornelius's rival, and that *Novatianus*, or *Novatian*, is the denomination of his followers.

I am sorry to have spent so much time upon this point: and if, for the sake of brevity, I have omitted to take particular notice of any difficulty in Mr. Jackson, I hope the reader will find it obviated in the note upon chap. xlvii. p. 248—252.

T H E
C R E D I B I L I T Y
O F T H E
G O S P E L H I S T O R Y,
P A R T I I.

[VOL. VI. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCXLV.]

C H A P. LXII.

ARCHELAUS, bishop in Mesopotamia.

I. *The history and antiquity of a work ascribed to Archelaus.* II. *Extracts out of it, and the author's testimony to the books of the New Testament.*

I. SAYS Jerom: ' Archelaus ^a, a bishop of Mesopotamia, wrote in the Syriac language a book of his Conference [or Dispute] with Manichee at his coming out of Persia, which has been translated into Greek. He flourished under the emperor Probus, who succeeded Aurelian and Tacitus.'

This piece, as we now have it, contains two conferences with Mani, one at Caschar, or Carchar, a city in the Roman part of Mesopotamia, and another at Diodoris, a village, or a small town, in the same country: with an historical account of the life and death of Mani, and some other things.

The greatest part of it is now only in a Latin translation, not made from the supposed Syriac original, but from ^b Greek. When this Latin translation was made is not certain. Zacagni, the editor, supposeth that ^c it was not in being in Jerom's time, but that however it was made before the seventh century. Ano-

^a Archelaus episcopus Mesopotamiæ librum disputationis suæ, quam habuit adversum Manichæum, exeuntem ex Perside, Syro sermone composuit, qui translatus in Græcum habetur a multis. Claruit sub Imperatore Probo, qui Aureliano et

Tacito successerat. De V. I. c. 71.

^b Porro Græcam versionem, non vero Syriacum textum præ manibus Latinum interpretem habuisse—fatis superque demonstratur. Zacagn. Præf. §. v. in.

^c ib. n. iv. f.

ther learned writer argues, that ^d this translation was not made sooner than the sixth, or the latter part of the fifth, century; because the conference itself was unknown to Augustine, and likewise to pope Leo, who died in 461.

It is thought that ^e this piece is not now entire and complete. Archelaus is placed by Cave, and many others, as flourishing about the year 278. Beausobre's opinion of this book, entitled 'The Acts of the Disputation of Archelaus with Mani, or Manichee,' is, 'that ^f it is, in general, a romance, published by some Greek, about the year of our Lord 330, fifty or sixty years after Mani's death.' 'There are in it,' he ^g says, 'some truths, but not many; and those disguised, and mixed with manifest falsehoods.' Again: 'It ^h is a fiction of some Greek, who, having got some memoirs concerning the life and opinions of Mani, resolved to write a history of him, and confute his errors.'

I fear that account of this book is too just, and that a large part of it is fiction; of which I may say more in the next (A) chapter. At present I would chiefly consider the author, and the time of this work.

As for the author of the book, Jerom supposed it to have been written in Syriac by Archelaus himself, and then translated into Greek: but he does not name the translator. Epiphanius ⁱ likewise, and ^k Cyril of Jerusalem, and ^l Socrates, ascribe the book to Archelaus: but by Photius we are informed that ^m Heracleon, bishop of Chalcedon, in his book against the Manichees, said, Hegemonius wrote the Dispute of Archelaus. This has induced ⁿ Cave, and others, to look upon Hegemonius as the

^d See Beausobr. Hist. de Manich. T. i. Diff. Prelim. p. 6.

^e Illud tamen dissimulare non possum, Acta ista disputationis Archelai cum Manete, quæ ex Vaticano Casinensis codicis apographo primis edimus, integra nequaquam videri, sed pluribus in locis a librario mutilata. Zac. ib. n. 14. in.

^f En general toute cette piece, qu'on nomme les Actes de la Dispute d'Archelaus, n'est qu'un roman fabriqué par un Grec et publié depuis l'an 330, cinquante ans, ou environ, après la mort de Manichée. Beauf. ib. p. 6.

^g Il y a quelques veritez, mais en petit nombre, et le peu qu'il y en a est alteré, confus, mêlé de fables manifestes.—id.

^h Dès que j'eus lu cette piece, que M. Zaccagni, bibliothecaire du Vatican, publia le premier toute entiere, j'eus grand soupçon, que la Dispute de Cas-

car, n'étoit qu'une fiction de quelque Grec, qui ayant eu des mémoires touchant la vie et les dogmes de Manichée, voulut écrire son histoire, et refuter ses erreurs. L'examen changea mes soupçons en certitude. Id. in Preface. T. i. p. vi.

(A) See the first section in the next chapter, numb. i. 2. ⁱ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχελαίου βιβλίου. Epiph. H. 66, n. 32, in. Vid. et n. 21.

^k Cat. 6, n. 27, p. 104.

^l H. E. l. i. c. 22, p. 56, D.

^m Ηγεμονίον τε τὸν [ταῖς] ἀρχελαίου πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογίας ἀναγράφαντα. Phot. Cod. 85, p. 204.

ⁿ Unde conceptis pene verbis jurare ausim, non alium hujusce versionis auctorem fuisse quam Hegemonium nostrum, nec aliam eam, quam quæ Cyrillus, Epiphanius, alique olim usi sunt. Cav. De Hegemonio, in Diff. de Scriptor. incert. et.

translator. Zacagni says that ^o Hegemonius not only translated the Syriac, but made additions of his own. To the like purpose ^p Affeman. Both which last writers ascribe such additions and alterations to Hegemonius, an author whose age is unknown, as must greatly lessen the authority of this work; more, perhaps, than they imagined.

But Beaufobre says that this piece was originally written in Greek, and that Hegemonius was the author, and that it was not written before the year 330. He argues in this ^q manner: 'Eusebius published his Ecclesiastical History about fifty years after the death of Mani. He there speaks of this heresiarch, and his heresy: but he says not one word of his excursion into the Roman Mesopotamia, nor of his disputes with Archelaus. Since Eusebius says nothing of these matters, it may be concluded that he was entirely ignorant of them: but it is not to be supposed that he should be ignorant of so public an event, that had happened half a century before: nor that he should omit to relate so memorable a thing if he knew it.' Beaufobre thinks that Archelaus must have been entirely unknown to Eusebius: and therefore he concludes that these Acts of Archelaus did not appear until after Eusebius had published his Ecclesiastical History; that is, in the space of time between the year 326 or 330, and the year 348 or 350, when Cyril of Jerusalem wrote his Catechetical Discourses, who is the first author that has quoted this piece. Nor does it appear that ^r St. Ephrem, who was of Mesopotamia, and died in 373, has any where taken notice of this Disputation, though he often speaks of Mani. Moreover there is a particular in the book itself, which leads him to conclude it was composed between the years 330 and 340. This time, says Beaufobre, is distinctly marked in some words, which the writer puts into the mouth of Archelaus, for convincing Mani that he could not be the promised Paraclete. 'When ^s you say you are the Paraclete, perhaps you little think that you charge Christ with falsehood: who, though he promised to send him soon after his resurrection, has not sent him

^o —Hegemonium vero, quæ ab Archelao jam edita fuerant, meliori non solum ordine digessisse, verum etiam exordio, epilogo, aliisque nonnullis locupletasse, ut omnibus numeris absoluta, celeberrimæ illius disputationis acta ad posteros transmitterentur. Zac. Praef. cap. 4, p. iv.

^p Quæ quum ita sint, ab eodem Hegemonio videntur quædam ex illis Actis mutilata, quædam etiam addita. Affem. Bib. or. T. 3. P. 2 p. 47, in. Vid. quæ

ibidem præeunt et sequuntur.

^q B. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 5, 6, p. 145, 146. ^r Ib. p. 146.

^s —dicens se esse paracletum, qui ab Jesu præsignatus est mitti, in quo mendacem ignorans fortasse asseret Jesum: qui enim dixerat se non multo post missurum esse paracletum, invenitur post trecentos, et eo amplius annos misisse hunc. Arch. c. 27, p. 46.

P. 7.

'till above three hundred years afterwards.' These three hundred years come out in the year of our Lord 333 or 334. Zacagni says this 'dropped from Archelaus in the heat of dispute: because from the death of Christ, to the conference at Caschar, there were not more than 249 years: but, says ^u Beaufobre, I think otherwise. Nothing is more common than for impostors, who make another speak, not to remember every thing that is agreeable to the character they have introduced, and to thrust in themselves without thinking of it. Hegemonius, who in fact lived more than three hundred years after our Saviour's resurrection, thought of the time when he himself lived, not that of Archelaus, who was speaking. So that learned author.

I must be here indulged the liberty of making some remarks. I readily own I am inclined to think with Beaufobre that this work was originally written in Greek, not in Syriac.

The argument from the silence of Eusebius is specious; and yet, possibly, not conclusive. It is indeed strange that he should never mention the name of Archelaus. Nor do I pretend to confute this argument of Beaufobre; for it is almost inconceivable, that Eusebius should be ignorant of Archelaus, if these disputes were real. However, I would not omit any thoughts which offer, and may tend to bring truth to light; and therefore I observe, that though Archelaus and these conferences in Mesopotamia are never mentioned by Eusebius, some may suspect that he had seen this book called The Acts of Archelaus: for in his Ecclesiastical History, when he speaks of Mani, and so particularly insists ^{*} upon the barbarism of his language and manners, he may be thought to refer to passages in the Acts, which ^v resemble his account. And in his ^z Chronicle the appearance of Mani is placed in the reign of Probus, agreeably to these ^a Acts. Indeed I do not lay much stress upon this last particular, because I think the article concerning Mani, in the Chronicle, may be entirely Jerom's, and not Eusebius's: but with Beaufobre it should have some weight, because he allows that ^b whole paragraph to be Eusebius's.

^{*} Contentionis astu actus videtur hic dixisse Archelaus, post trecentos et amplius annos a Christi morte Manetem emersisse: nam a Christi morte usque ad habitum cum Manete disputationis tempus, anni disciter 249, intercedunt. Zacagni not. ad Arch. p. 46. ^u Beauf. ubi supr. p. 153.

^{*} Παράλαος δὲ τὰ τοῖς βίαις ἀντιπαρὰ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν. — H. E. l. 7. c. 31.

^v Persa barbare, non Græcorum lin-

guæ, non Ægyptiorum, non Romanorum, non ullius alterius linguæ scientiam habere potuisti, sed Chaldaeorum solum, quæ ne in numerum quidem aliquem ducitur. Act. Arch. c. 36, p. 63. Et Confer. c. 12, p. 23.

^z Secundo anno Probi — infena Manichæorum hæresis in commune humani generis malum exorta. Euf. Chr. p. 177.

^a c. 27, p. 46. ^b B. ib. p. 122.

As for the space of three hundred years, mentioned in the Acts, it deserves little consideration. Arguments from numbers are oftentimes of small moment. Some mistakes are made by transcribers. Writers themselves are not seldom mistaken in their computations. St. Chrysostom^c reckoned it to have been five hundred years from the destruction of Jerusalem to his own time, though it was not much above three hundred years. It was to the purpose of the person, who managed the supposed dispute against Mani, to enhance the time. Moreover people delight in round numbers. And just before the time is said to be^d almost three hundred years. It is the less likely that the writer should forget himself, and put his own time instead of that of the speaker's, because he presently afterwards mentions the reign of^e Probus.

Having given these sentiments of others, and made remarks upon them, I now proceed to observe, that the antiquity of this piece is manifest from the use made of it by Cyril and Epiphanius in the fourth century, and from the notice taken of it by Jerom in his Catalogue, before the end of the same century.

There are other arguments of it's early age: I shall mention several things, though not all of equal importance.

Archelaus, or whoever is the writer, naming several heretics, mentions none below^f Sabellius: nor do there any where appear in this book any traces of that remarkable period in the church, the council of Nice. Moreover, the author allots but^g one year to Christ's ministry, or at least to the most public part of it, after he had called his disciples to attend him. He allows that^h men might attain to virtue by the light of nature, though a few only. He does not extol affected voluntary poverty, as some have done; butⁱ allows him, who well useth a good estate, to be equally virtuous with him who gives away all he has. Tillemont says: 'In this^k work we meet with some opinions ' more common in the primitive times, than they have been since ' the history and the doctrine of the church have been cleared

^c Πεντακοσίον γὰρ ἔσται τὸ ἐκ τῆς καταστροφῆς τοῦ Ἱεροσολύμων ἕως τοῦ χρόνου τούτου. Chrys. adv. Jud. Hom. 6. T. i. p. 651, B. ^d — cum qui post trecentos fere annos venerit. Arch. n. 27. p. 45. ^e — sub Probo, demum Romano imperatori misisti. ib. p. 46.

^f Vid. cap. 37. et 38. ^g Nec in aliquo remoratus Dominus noster Jesus intra unius anni spatium languentium multitudines reddidit sanitati, mortuos luci. ib. c. 34, p. 58. Cum discipuli ejus per annum integrum manserunt cum eo. ib.

c. 50, p. 93, m. ^h Verum quia pauci per hunc modum poterant ad justitiæ culmen ascendere, id est, per parentum traditiones, nulla in literis lege conscripta. c. 28, p. 48. ⁱ Bonum, inquam, his qui possunt: sed abuti divitiis ad opus justitiæ atque misericordiæ parem gratiam tribuit, [Jesus,] ac si universis pariter renantietur. c. 42, p. 75.

^k Mem. Ec. T. 4. P. 2. Les Manichéens. Art. 12, p. 796.

p. 2.

'up. The author seems not to understand the union of the two 'natures in Christ.' Beausobre has an observation of the like kind, and says, that 'the author speaks more like an unitarian 'than a catholic.' I add, that he seems to have condemned all war as unlawful; for, ^m relating that some Roman soldiers, charmed with the piety and generosity of Marcellus, were induced to embrace the Christian religion, he says that they immediately forsook the profession of arms.

These particulars may be reckoned evidences of great antiquity: but when the book was composed, I cannot certainly say; whether near the end of the third or at the beginning of the fourth century: nor am I able to determine who is the author.

II. My extracts out of it will contain chiefly the author's testimony to the books of the New Testament.

1. But I would just observe that ⁿ he speaks of divers of our Lord's miracles, and other historical facts, recorded in the gospels.

2. We do not find all the books of the New Testament quoted in this piece: it is likely that there was no particular occasion for it.

3. He mentions ^o the New Testament, the gospels, and the apostle Paul's epistles: for which not only he, but Mani likewise, had a great regard.

4. Quoting St. Matthew's gospel, he calls him ^p an evangelist of the Spirit.

5. A passage of St. Mark's gospel is cited ^q as the word of God.

6. Quoting John i. 16, he calls ^r him 'Saint John the greatest of the evangelists;' if that is not the style of the Latin translator.

7. Here is mention made of ^s the book of the gospels.

¹ Beauf. ib. p. 116. ^m At illi [militibus] admirati, et amplexi tam immensum vii pietatem, munificentiamque,—commoveantur, ut plurimi ex ipsis adderentur ad fidem domini nostri Jesu Christi, derelicto militie cingulo. Arch. cap. 1. p. 2. Vid. ib. Zacagn. not. [3.] et conf. Beauf. Hist. Manich. T. 2. p. 797. ⁿ Vid. cap. 34. p. 58, c. 36, p. 63.

^o Sunt etiam alia multa, quæ dici possent et de apostolo Paulo, et de Evangelistis, ex quibus ostendere possumus, veterem legem non esse alterius, quam Domini, cuius est novum Testamentum. Arch. c. 45.

p. 82. Vid. etiam cap. 40, p. 69, m.

^p Sed et Spiritus Evangelista Matthæus [cap. xxiv] diligenter significavit Domini nostri Jesu Christi sermonem. Act. Arch. c. 35, p. 61.

^q Quid enim ait sermo divinus? Quis enim potest introire in domum fortis, et diripere vasa ejus, nisi illo sit fortior? [Mar. iii. 27] ib. c. 16, p. 30.

^r Sed et sanctus Joannes maximus Evangelistarum ait, gratiam gratia præstare, &c. ib. c. 45, p. 82. ^s —sicut scriptum est in Evangeliorum libro. c. 13, p. 24.

8. The book of the Acts is quoted and called ^t scripture.

9. Divers of St. Paul's epistles are expressly quoted. That to the Romans is called ^u his first epistle, because, as I suppose, it was placed first in the collection.

10. There seems to be an expression, borrowed from the epistle to the Hebrews, in Mani's ^x letter to Marcellus, inserted in these Acts: and there appears to be a reference to Hebr. iii. 3, 5, 6, in some words of ^y Archelaus.

11. I do not see any of the Catholic epistles quoted, except the first epistle of St. John. Mani himself is here brought in arguing from ^z 1 John v. 19: *The whole world lies in wickedness, or in the wicked one, as he understands it.*

12. Antichrist is here often ^a spoken of: but there is scarce any clear reference to the book of the Revelation. However, it should be observed by us, that in the Revelation, ch. xii. 9, Satan is represented by the character of the *great dragon*. And in this dispute he is spoken of ^b as 'the dragon, our perpetual enemy.'

13. The writer's respect for the scriptures now commonly received, is manifest from his very numerous and frequent quotations of them as decisive, and of authority in all disputed points of religion.

CHAP. LXIII.

MANI, and his followers.

SECT. I. A general history of the MANICHEES.

- I. *Passages of ancient writers concerning them.* 1. *Eusebius of Caesarea;* 2. *Socrates;* 3. *Libanius.* II. *Authors who wrote against them;* 1. *Heracleon;* 2. *Alexander of Lycopolis;* 3. *Augustine;* 4. *Serapion;*

^t Quid enim dicit scriptura? Quia unusquisque propria sua lingua audiebat, per Paracletum spiritum loquentes apostolos? ib. c. 36, p. 63. Vid. et cap. 34, p. 59.

^u Ipse quoque in prima epistola sua posuit, dicens. ib. c. 34, p. 59.

^x Ἀρχὴ γὰρ, καὶ τέλος, καὶ τὸ τετὸν πατέρα τῶν κακῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θεὸν ἀναφέρειν, ὡς τὸ τέλος καταρὰς ἡγῶν. ib. c. 5, p. 7. Vid. Hebr. vi. 8. ^y Ita et si Dominus meus Jesus Christus praeclit in gloria Moysen,

tanquam Dominus famulum, non propterea respuenda est gloria Moysi. Arch. c. 43, p. 77.

^z Malum vero esse tam mundum hunc, quam omnia quae in eo sunt, — sicut ait Joannes, Totus mundus in maligno est positus, et non in Deo. cap. 14, p. 26.

^a Vid. c. 36, p. 62, 63. ^b Credo, quod habeat adiutorem draconem illum, qui nobis semper inimicus est. c. 40, p. 69.

p. 17.

5. *Titus of Bostra*; 6. *Didymus*; 7. *Authors omitted by Fabricius*; 8. *Syrian authors against them*. III. *Though they were in many places, they were no where numerous*. IV. *Eminent men among the Manichees*; 1. *Alexander of Lycopolis*; 2. *Augustine*; 3. *Admantus*; 4. *Agapius*; 5. *Apikonius*; 6. *Faustus*; 7. *Hierax*; 8. *Sebastian*; 9. *Secundinus*. V. *Their ecclesiastical constitution*. VI. *Their manners vindicated from Aspersions*. VII. *A brief account of the persecutions which they suffered*.

I CHUSE to begin this chapter with a general history of Mani, and the sect called after his name.

I. In the first place I would allege some passages of ancient writers who have mentioned them.

1. Eusebius's article concerning them in his Ecclesiastical History is to this purpose: 'About ^a the same time that madman, sily named Manes, formed the wild heresy called after his name, being set up for the ruin of many by Satan the adversary of God. This person ^b was a barbarian in every respect, both in his speech, and in his manners. As for his (A) disposition, it was diabolical and furious; for he made an appearance of being Christ himself. Sometimes he gave out that he was the Comforter, and the Holy Ghost himself. To madness he added excessive pride; and, as if he had been Christ, he chose twelve to be companions with him in his innovation. His scheme was patched up of many false and impious heresies, long since extinct. This venomous principle was brought into our world, the Roman empire, from Persia. From that time the impious doctrine of the Manichees has infected many. Such was the rise of that science falsely so called.'

In this place Eusebius appears much out of humour: he is scarce master of himself: whether his expressions are just may perhaps be considered hereafter.

In his, or Jerom's Chronicle, the rise of this sect is with much particularity distinctly fixed at the second year of the emperor Probus, which is the year of Christ 277.

^a Εἰς ταῦτα καὶ ὁ μαγὸς τὰς φωνὰς, ἐπαυ-
ρῶν τὰς δαιμονίους ἀρετὰς. — Euf. H.
E. l. 7, c. 31. ^b Βαρβαρὸς ὄντα τοῦ εἶναι
ἀνθρώπου καὶ τρώει, τὴν τε φύσιν δαιμονίαν
καὶ κακὴν. Ἀρχὴν δὲ ταῦτος εὐχρη-
στῶν, ὥστε αὐτὸς μετὰ φασθαι σπείρατο, τότε
καὶ τὴν παρὰ τὴν φύσιν, καὶ αὐτὸ το πνεῦμα το
ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀνακρίπτων. κ. λ. ib.

(a) Beaufobre thinks that here Euse-

bis has done wrong to Mani, and that his picture of Mani has little resemblance. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 108.

^c Secundo anno Probi, juxta Antiochenos cccxxv. anno juxta Tyrios cccclii. — infana Manichæorum heresis in commune humani generis malum exorta. Euseb. Chron. p. 177.

This would be a proper place for me to consider the time of the rise of Manichæism: but being unwilling to render this article, the general history of Manichæism, too prolix, I shall defer it until I come to give a succinct history of Mani himself.

However I would here observe, that I do not remember the Manichees to be any where else mentioned by Eusebius; which may be reckoned somewhat strange, if in his time they were numerous in any parts of the Roman empire: in his Commentaries upon the Psalms and Isaiah, and elsewhere, he might have had frequent occasions to confute them. A great number of heresies of various kinds, some ^d resembling the Manichæan principle, are censured in the Apology for Origen, written jointly by Pamphilus and Eusebius. If the Manichees had been well known in the Roman empire, at the beginning of the fourth century, we might have expected to see them there particularly named, which they are not.

Since writing this, I have observed these words in Tillemont, whom nothing escapes. The article concerning the Manichees in the Chronicle he considers as Jerom's: it is only the passage in the History which he reckons Eusebius's; whereupon he says: 'Eusebius, who speaks little of this heresy, does not precisely mark the time of it: he seems willing however to have it thought that it began in the time of pope Felix, who governed the church, according to him, from 276 to 281.'

2. In the next place I intend to transcribe a long passage of Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, who flourished about the year of Christ 440.

'But ^e it is an usual thing for cockle to grow up among good grain. It is agreeable to envy to lay snares for the righteous. Not long before the reign of Constantine there sprang up a kind of heathenish Christianity, which mingled itself with the true Christian religion: as heretofore false prophets arose together with the prophets, and false apostles with the apostles. For in those days the doctrine of Empedocles, a heathen philosopher, was clandestinely introduced into Christianity: of this Eusebius Pamphilus has made mention in the seventh book of his Ecclesiastical History, but without any particularity; for which reason I have judged it not improper to supply his omissions; thereby it may be known who this Manichee was, and whence

^d —vel secundum eos, qui Deum quidem fatentur, non tamen hominem assumisse, id est, animum corpusque terrenum, qui sub specie quasi amplioris gloriæ Jesu Domino deferenda, omnia quæ ab eo gesta sunt phantastice magis quam vere gesta

esse testantur. Pro Orig. Ap. ap. Hieron. Opp. T. 5, p. 226, m.

^e Note v. sur les Manich. T. iv. P. 2, p. 956.

^f Vid. Euf. l. 7, cap. 30, 31, p. 283, C.

^g Socrat. H. E. l. i. c. 22, 55—57.

p. 22.

he came, who made this audacious attempt. One Scythian, a Saracen, married a captive woman, native of the Upper Thebais; upon her account he lived in Egypt. Having been instructed in the learning of the Egyptians, he introduced the doctrine of Empedocles and Pythagoras into Christianity; asserting ^h two natures, one good, the other evil, as Empedocles did; and calling the evil nature Discord, the good nature Friendship. Buddas, formerly named Terebinthus, became a disciple of that Scythian: he travelled into the country of Babylonia, which is inhabited by the Persians, where he told a great many strange stories of himself; as that he was born of a virgin, and brought up in the mountains: afterwards he wrote four books, one of which was entitled, Of Mysteries, another The Gospel, a third The Treasure, and the fourth Heads, [or Chapters.] While he was performing some of his pretended sacred rites he was thrown down by a spirit and died. The woman at whose house he dwelled buried him: she, coming to the possession of his money, bought a boy seven years of age, named (B) Cubricus; this boy she made free and gave him a good education. Some time after this (c) she died, leaving the boy all the estate she had by Terebinthus, and the books he had written, according to the instructions received from Scythian. Cubricus now free, and thus enriched, went into Persia; where he changed his name, calling himself Manes: there he distributed among his seduced followers the books of Buddas, or Terebinthus, as his own. The contents of these books are in expression Christian, in sentiment heathenish; for the impious Manichee directs the worship of many gods, and teaches that the sun ought to be adored: he likewise introduces ⁱ fate, and destroys man's free-will. He openly teaches transmigration; following herein the sentiment

^h Διὸ φησιν ἑστῶν, ἀγαθὴν τε καὶ πονηρὰν, αἷμα ἐκτεταμένης νύκτος ἐνομαζέων τὴν πονηρὰν, φησὶν δὲ τὴν ἀγαθὴν. ib. p. 55, C.

(B) Named Cubricus.] He is generally so called. Cyril and Epiphanius write the name Κούβρικος, as well as Socrates. But in the Acts of Archelaus his name is written Corbicus. Quæ cum sola esset, habere aliquem ad ministerium voluit, et comparavit sibi puerum annorum ferme septem, Corbicium nomine, quem statim manumissit, ac literis erudit. Act. Arch. c. 53, p. 97. In the Historia Hæreseos Manicheorum, published by Pfaff, at the end of Lactantii Epitome, p. 183, the name is a little different. — Puerum sibi profectibus solatio comparavit, nomine Cur-

bitius, quem et literis non mediocribus erudit. In former editions of Augustine, Mani's first name is said to have been Urbicus. But in the Benedictine edition that paragraph, at the beginning of Augustine's article of the Manichees, [De Hær. c. 46] is left out upon the authority of manuscripts. Beausobre says, none of these names have an Oriental air. And he suspects, that the right name is Carcubius. See Beauf. T. i. p. 67.

(c) When that widow died, Cubricus is said to have been twelve years of age. Quique cum duodecim annorum esset effectus, anus illa diem obiit, &c. ap. Arch. c. 53, p. 97. ⁱ Καὶ ἐννομεύμενος ἐστῶν, καὶ τὸ ἐφ' ἧρας ἀναίρη. Socr. ib. p. 56, A.

‘ of

‘ of Empedocles, Pythagoras, and the Egyptians. He denies
 ‘ that ^k Christ had real flesh, making him a mere phantom. He
 ‘ rejects the law and the prophets, and calls himself the Para-
 ‘ clete: all which things are contrary to the sense of the ortho-
 ‘ dox church. Moreover, in ^l his epistles he had the presump-
 ‘ to style himself apostle: at length he met with the deserved
 ‘ punishment of such an impostor upon this occasion. The son
 ‘ of the king of Persia happened to fall sick; the father, as the
 ‘ saying is, left no stone unturned, being extremely desirous to
 ‘ save his son’s life: having heard of Manichee, and ^m, supposing
 ‘ the strange things he had heard of him to be true, he sends for
 ‘ him as an apostle, hoping that by him he might save his son:
 ‘ when he was come he pretended to undertake the cure of the
 ‘ king’s son. But when the king saw that his son died in his
 ‘ hands, he shut him up in prison, intending to put him to death;
 ‘ but he made his escape and came into Mesopotamia. The king
 ‘ of Persia hearing that he was in those parts sent after him, got
 ‘ him apprehended, and slayed him alive: after which his skin
 ‘ was filled with chaff and hung up at the gate of the city. This
 ‘ account is no forgery of ours; it is collected out of the book
 ‘ of Archelaus, bishop of Caschar, a city in Mesopotamia, which
 ‘ we have met with and read: for Archelaus himself says he had
 ‘ disputed with him in person; and he there relates the several
 ‘ particulars which I have just written concerning him.’

Thus I have given the history of Mani and his principles in the words of this ancient writer, which will serve for a text to be commented upon. Once I was somewhat desirous to set before my readers in this place St. Augustine’s article of the Manichees in his book *Of Heresies*; but it is too abstruse and dogmatical; therefore I thought this historical account preferable. There is another reason which discouraged the design of translating Augustine, and may be soon perceived by those who look into him: but though I do not here, nor any where else, translate that article of Augustine entire, I shall make good use of it, and frequently quote it.

In this passage of Socrates we see a proof of the truth of Beaufobre’s observation, that ⁿ from the book called *The Acts of Ar-*

^k Καὶ τοὺς χριστοὺς ἐν σαρκὶ γεγονέναι οὐ βου-
 λεται, φαντάσμα αὐτοὺς λέγων εἶναι· καὶ ἰο-
 μοὺ καὶ προφῆτας ἀθετεῖ· καὶ αὐτοὺς ἰομαζέει
 παρακλῆτον. ib. p. 56, B.

^l Ἐν δε ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς καὶ ἀποστόλων αὐτοὺς
 ἰομαζέειν ἐτόλμησεν. ibid.

^m μάθων τε περὶ τοῦ μανηχαίου, καὶ τὰς

τιρατίας αὐτῆ ἰομαζέειν εἶναι ἀληθεῖς, καὶ
 ἀποστόλων μεταπηρῶνται, πείνους δὲ αὐτοὺς
 σωθῆναι τοὺς υἱοὺς· ὁ δὲ παραγενομένος μετὰ
 τῇ ἐπιτάλῃ σχήματος ἐγχερίζεται τοῖς τοῦ
 βασιλεως υἱοῖς· ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐωρακὴς ὅτι ὁ
 παῖς ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἐτεβήκει, κ. λ. ib. p. 56,
 C. ⁿ Beauf. Hist. de Manich. p. 6. F. i.

p. 28.

Archelaus, the ancient Christian writers took the history of Mani and of the origin of Manichæism, which they have given us. Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Socrates, the Greeks in general, have all drawn from this source; as is acknowledged too by ^o Petavius and ^p Tillemont.

We have seen the account which Socrates gives of the death of Mani, taken from the forementioned book: but Socrates flourishes when he says that ‘the king of Persia, having heard of the strange things said to be done by Mani, and believing them to be true, sent for him as an apostle.’ There is nothing like this in Archelaus, whose ^a words I transcribe at the bottom of the page.

That Mani was put to death needs not to be contested. It is mentioned by ^r Alexander of Lycopolis: the memory of it was celebrated ^s by his followers in an annual festivity, observed by them with a good deal of pomp and splendour: and, as ^t Beausobre says, ‘it is not impossible but the death of the young prince may have brought upon him the displeasure of the king: but it is certain that the eastern writers do ascribe this disgrace to his opinions in religion; and, if I may say it, to his Christianity, which seems to be better proved.’

Indeed the author of the dispute seems himself to have been aware of something of this kind; for he says that ^u Mani, whilst in prison, sent out his disciples to spread abroad his opinions. The king, being informed of this, sends orders for putting him to death: but, as he says, Mani bribing his keepers with a large sum of money, got out of prison, and thus escaped for the present.

Beausobre has a large number of exceptions to the history of

^e Ex hac Archelai relatione cæteri deinceps hauserunt omnes, qui hæretici istius historiam et dogmata scriptis tradiderunt. Petav. Animadv. ad. Epiph. p. 289.

^f Les petites différences, qui se rencontrent entre eux, (savoir Epiphane, Cyrille, Socrate;) n’empêchent pas qu’on ne voye, qu’ils ont tous puisé dans la même source. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. 4, P. 2, Art. 12, p. 794. ^g Cum ergo illi essent præfati, regis filius aegritudine quadam arreptus est, quem rex curari desiderans, editum proposuit in vita, [f. invitans;] si quis eum curare possit, accipere præmium, multo proposito. Tum iste—præsentiam tuam Manes exhibet, dicens se esse puerum curaturum, quæ cum audisset rex, suscepit eum cum obsequio, ac libenter habuit. Verum—mortuus est puer in manibus ejus, vel potius extinctus. Arch.

c. 53, p. 98. ^r —συρρατευσαι τι σαρπηρ τω περση προσκηνωσαντα δε τι τω απιλαδηνι. Alex. Lyc. p. 4. in.

^s —cum vestrum bema, id est, diem quo Manichæus occisus est, quinque gradibus instructo tribunali et pretiosis linteis adornato,—magnis honoribus prosequamini. Aug. contr. Ep. Fund. c. 8.

^t B. ib. p. 82, 85, 86. ^u His ergo tam scelerate compositis, mittit et discipulos suos prædicaturos intrepide fictos simulatosque errores, et novas, falsasque voces annuntiaturus per loca singula. Quod cum rex Persarum cognovisset, dignis eum suppliciis subdere parat. Quo Manes agnito, admonitus in somnis, elapsus de carcere, in fugam versus est, auro plurimo custodibus corruptis, et mansit in castello Arabionis. Arch. c. 59, p. 69.

‘Mani,

Mani in the Acts of Archelaus's Dispute, to whom I refer the reader. I shall put down here some observations which I have myself made in reading those Acts.

Mani was a Persian: but the writer of the Dispute seems little acquainted with Persian affairs. He supposeth that Probus was the Roman emperor at the time in which he placeth the conference; but the king of Persia, so often mentioned by that title, is never named. Some may be apt to suspect he did not certainly know who was king of Persia when Probus was emperor, and therefore feared to put down any name, lest it would be a mistake, which might afterwards be detected and exposed: then the history of Mani is here related, as if the whole course of his affairs happened under one prince only; whereas learned moderns are now clearly of opinion that ^{*}those transactions were in the time of three or four reigns of several kings of Persia. Moreover, this writer supposeth, that Mani, or his teachers and predecessors, learned the doctrine of two natures, or two principles, from Empedocles, and other Greeks; whereas it is much more likely that he had it from the [†] Persians.

There are many improbabilities in the historical part of that dispute. Mani is said to have been imprisoned; but, if the king of Persia had been displeased with him on account of the death of his son, I think he would not have sent him to prison, but would have put him to death presently.

Supposing Mani to have been imprisoned by the king of Persia, it is not easy to conceive how he could escape, and get to Caschar, or Carchar, said to be a city in the Roman Mesopotamia.

The writer of the Dispute says, in that city lived a Christian, of great note for wealth and liberality: Mani in Persia heard of his fame, and was very desirous, as [‡] is related, to make a convert of him, hoping he might by him gain the whole province; but not chusing to come to him without some previous notice, he

^{*} Sharistani in libro de Religionibus Orientis de eo refert: Mani apparuit tempore Shabur filii Ardeshir, et occidit eum Behram filius Hormuz, Filii Shabur, Hyde de Relig. V. Pers. cap. 21, p. 282, Conf. Herbelot Bib. Orient. V. Mani.

Mais voici une ignorance, une erreur, qu'on ne sauroit excuser. C'est d'avoir mis sous un même regne le cours entier d'une affaire, qui commença sous l'ayeul, ou le bisayeul, et qui ne s'acheva que sous le petit-fils, ou l'arrière-petit-fils. Beauf. T. I. p. 128.

Car Sapor, qui regnoit depuis 240, ou 241, mourut vets 271. Hormisdas son

filz en 272, et Vararane filz d'Hormisdas en 276. Ainsi ce sera Vararane II. filz de celui-ci, qui aura fait mourir Manichéen en 277, ou 278. Till. Mem. Ec. Les Manichéens Art. vii. in fin. [†] Græcis Bouda Empedoclis opinionem amplexus dicitur, duo rerum pugnantia inter se principia statuens. — Verum rectius a Persarum magis accepisse videtur. Hyde ib. p. 285. — Verum rectius a Persis, seu Persarum magis id accepisse videtur, qui *αγαθον δαίμονα, και κακον δαίμονα* statuabant, ut est apud Laertium in Protagora, &c. Toll. Insign. Ital. p. 126, in not. [‡] Arch. c. 4, p. 5.

p. 32.

deputes one of his disciples, by name Turbo, whom he sends with a letter to that eminent Christian: this letter is fully inscribed: 'Manichee^a to Marcellus.' But could that be safely or prudently done by a man escaped out of prison, and every where sought by his sovereign?

The^b messenger, who carries back an answer from Marcellus, finds Mani in a castle named (D) Arabion, a Persian fortress, as it seems, and upon the frontier: Mani thereupon comes in great haste to Marcellus at Caschar; and he^c has in his company two-and-twenty, or, as in another copy, twelve young men and virgins; that is, so^d many men who professed virginal chastity; and he is himself dressed very politely after the Persian manner. How can it be thought that a person under his prince's displeasure should travel with such attendants?

Moreover, when the disputations in the Roman part of Mesopotamia were over, and he was disagreeable to the people of Caschar and Diodoris, where the conferences were held, he^e returns to Arabion, where he is taken up by the king's soldiers: but would any man of common sense act in this manner, who was liable to capital punishment for such an offence as is here supposed?

It is also remarkable that Mani's letter to Marcellus, brought by Turbo, begins in this manner: 'Manichee^f apostle of Jesus Christ, and all the saints and virgins with me, send peace to Marcellus.'

Upon all which therefore I again observe, that Mani is said to have been imprisoned on account of the death of the king of Persia's son: but all the following particulars of his history represent him not a prisoner, but at full liberty; for^g his three

^a Arch. p. 6, cap. 5.

^b Marcellus vero, accito uno ex pueris suis, Callisto nomine, precipit proficisci, qui nihil moratus, illico proficiscitur; et post triduum pervenit ad Manem, quem in castello quodam Arabionis reperit, atque epistolam tradidit. Arch. c. 6, p. 9.

(D) Concerning Arabion see Tillem. as before, art. 8, at the end.

^e Eadem autem ipsa die adventavit Manes, adducens secum juvenes, et virgines electos ad viginti duo simul—et primo—ad Marcellum ingreditur salutandum. Quo ille viso admiratus est primo habitus indumenta. Habebat enim calciamenti genus, quod quadrifole vulgo appellari solet; pallium autem varium, tanquam arina specie; in manu vero validissimum baculum tenebat ex ligno ebe- lino. Babylonium vero librum portabat

sub sinistra ala. Crura etiam braccis obtexerat colore diverso, quarum una rufa, alia velut prafini coloris erat. Vultus vero ut senis Persæ artificis, et bellorum ducis videbatur. Arch. c. 12, p. 23.

^d M. de Tillemont a pris ces vierges pour des filles.—Je ne sai si ceux de ses disciples, qui l'accompagnoient, étoient de jeunes hommes; mais je suis bien assuré qu'il n'y avoit de jeunes filles avec eux.—Ces *vierges* et ces *saints* sont les mêmes personnes. Aussi trouve-t-on dans un endroit de la version Latine *virgines Electos*, ce qui marque que ce sont des hommes. Beauf. T. i. p. 93.

^f Sed ille vias, quibus venerat, repetens, transito fluvio ad Arabionis castellum rediit, ubi postea comprehensus, oblatus est regi. Arch. c. 45, p. 100.

^g Ap. Arch. c. 5, p. 6.

chief

chief disciples, who had been sent out into several parts, return to him, and find him in prison, as is pretended: from thence he sends them out again, and they return: after which they are again sent abroad by him to propagate his principles. Soon after this he sends the beforementioned letter to Marcellus by Turbo; which was, as already observed, fully inscribed; and divers people, his followers, called saints, join with him in the wish of peace: to this letter he receives an answer from Marcellus, whose messenger has no directions of privacy, nor apprehensions of danger from carrying and delivering a letter to Mani: soon after this he comes to Marcellus with a numerous attendance, and is himself properly and richly habited like a Persian high priest or bishop. Was this man a prisoner? Are these things marks of chains and confinement? Finally, when the disputes in Mesopotamia are over, Mani returns to Arabion, a Persian fortress: that is, he makes the best of his way back again to Persia; which shews that before he made the excursion into Mesopotamia (if ever he made any) he was at full liberty: for he leaves the angry and offended Christians in Roman Mesopotamia, and returns to Persia, his own country, as a place of safety. Since, therefore, we are well assured that Mani was put to death, we may reckon it probable that in some short time after his return home he fell under his prince's displeasure, and was condemned by him for some cause or other: nor does any cause of offence appear more likely than his zeal in propagating some speculative opinions.

The history of Turbo is likewise improbable: this man was a disciple of Mani, and had been^b instructed by Addas, one of Mani's chief disciples: nor is it reasonable to think that a man should be employed in such an affair, who might not be confided in: but, having delivered his master's letter into the hands of Marcellus, when he is desired to go back with an answer, he excuseth himself; and a servant of Marcellus having been dispatched with the answer, Turbo presentlyⁱ gives Marcellus and Archelaus, bishop of the city, an odious, and perhaps false account, of Mani's doctrine.

Archelaus likewise, at the end of the disputes, appears to have with him one^k Sifinnius, who is supposed to give him particular information concerning Mani: but Sifinnius, according to^l Photius,

^a For the several following particulars see Arch. c. 53, 54. ^b Accitum unum ex discipulis, Turbonem nomine, qui per Addam fuerat instructus, tradita epistola, abire jubet, ac perferre Marcello. Arch. c. 4. p. 5. ⁱ Vid. Arch. c. 6, 7, et seqq. p. 9, &c. ^k Sed nunc paucissime

dicere volentem deprecor, ut cum silentio audiat, ut agnoscatis, qui sit, et unde, et qualis sit iste, qui advenit; sicut Sifinnius quidam, unus ex comitibus eius indicavit mihi, quem etiam ad testimonium coram, quæ a me dicentur, si placet, vocare paratus sum. Sed ne ipse quidem dicere re-

p. 37.

Photius, and ^m Peter of Sicily, was a chief disciple of Mani, and sat in his chair after him as his successor. However, whether those authors are to be relied upon as to that particular or not, it is not reasonable to think that Archelaus, a catholic bishop of the Roman Mesopotamia, should have with him at one and the same time two disciples and intimates of Mani, and both deserters.

Sisinnius is a Greek name: I should be glad to know more of him, if ever there was a Manichee of this name; it might perhaps afford some light for clearing up the time of this piece which we have been examining.

3. Valesius, in his notes upon Socrates, transcribes a passage out of a letter of Libanius to Priscian, president of Palestine; which letter he supposeth to relate to the Manichees in that province, though they are not named: 'These ⁿ men worship the sun, but without bloody sacrifices, and honour him as a deity in a secondary sense only. They pinch their belly to a great degree, and look upon the day of their death as the day of their deliverance. They are in many places of the world, but every where a few only: they injure no man, but some there are who give them trouble.'

II. That suits the Manichees; they were in many places, but no where numerous. That they were in many parts of the world may be concluded from the many books published against them. Fabricius ^o has a catalogue of ancient authors who have mentioned the Manichees, or written against them, amounting to more than forty in number; and yet that catalogue might be greatly enlarged.

Epiphanius, in his article of the Manichees, written about the year 376, speaking of authors who had written against them, nameth ^p Eusebius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Emesa, Serapion of Thmuis, Athanasius of Alexandria, George of Laodicea, Apollinarius of the same place, and Titus of Bosra; and he says there were other authors besides these who had written against them.

1. Photius, giving an account of Heracleian, bishop of Chalcedon, whose work he much commends, (whose time however is not now certainly known) says, that, speaking of others who

enavit eadem quæ nos dicimus, præsentem Mani. Credidit enim doctrinæ nostræ supradictus, sicut et apud me alius Turbo nomine. Arch. c. 51, p. 94.

^q Σισίνιος, ὁ καὶ τὸ αξίωμα αὐτῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδασκαλίας ἀναδεδειγμένος. Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 14, p. 59.

^r Sisinnius, qui Maneti successit. Pet. Sic. Hist. Manich. ap. B. Patr. T. 6, p.

75 S. A. ⁿ Οἱ τὸν ἥλιον ὡς θεὸν θεραπεύοντες αὐτοῦ αἵματος, καὶ τιμῶντες θεὸν προσήγορα δευτέρᾳ, καὶ τὴν γαστέρα κοδάζοντες, καὶ ἐν κερδαί πωσμένοι τῆς τῆς τελευταίας ψυχῆς. Πόλλυ καὶ μετὰ τῆς γῆς, πάντα καὶ ἀνθρώποι καὶ ἀδελφοὶ μετὰ ἡδονῆς, ληπτῆται δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Annot. in Socr. l. i. c. 22, p. 13.

^o Bib. Gr. T. V. p. 289—293.

^p Har. 66, n. 21, p. 638.

had

had opposed the same sect before him, he names ⁹ Hegemonius, who wrote the disputations of Archelaus with Mani; Titus, George of Laodicea, Serapion of Thmuis, and Diodorus, whose work against the Manichees consisted of five-and-twenty books: this work of Diodorus of Tarsus is in Ebedjesu's ⁷ Catalogue, and therefore must have been translated into Syriac. And Photius in his own work against the Manichees, or Paulicians, mentions ⁸ Cyril bishop of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Titus of Bostra, Serapion of Thmuis, Alexander of Lycopolis, the twenty books of Heracleon bishop of Chalcedon, upon whom he again bestows great commendations: but we have now nothing of that work remaining beside the extracts made by Photius.

2. The piece of Alexander, just mentioned, written in Greek, who was of Lycus, a city of Thebais in Egypt, is still in ¹ being. Fabricius supposeth that ² he was at first a heathen and Manichee, afterwards a catholic Christian. Cave ³ thinks he was originally a heathen, next a Manichee, in the end a catholic: he says that he is a very ancient writer, probably of the fourth century. Photius, as before cited, calls him ⁴ archbishop of Cyropolis: but Beaufobre argues that ⁵ he was a mere heathen or pagan philosopher, as he calls him. Tillemont likewise says, that ⁶ by ^a his book he appears to have been a pagan philosopher, who, observing that some of his fellow disciples embraced the opinion of the Manichees, wrote this piece to confute it by natural and philosophical reasons. He speaks with some respect of Jesus Christ, and prefers the doctrine of the churches [they are his own words] to that of Mani: but it may be perceived by those very places that he is by no means a Christian. I do not chuse to enter at present into any debate about the character of this writer: the reader, if he pleaseth, may consult the work itself, and the modern authors to whom I have referred: I shall only say that the Manichees were Christians. If ever Alexander was a Manichee he must have been a Christian at that time; what he was afterwards, when he wrote against them, is another question.

3. I do not think it needful to say any thing here particularly of Augustine, whose books however against the Manichees are numerous and still extant, and will be of great use to us, as will ap-

⁹ Cod. 85, p. 204.

Bib. Or. T. 3, P. i. p. 29.
Manich. l. i. cap. xi.
Auct. Nov.

¹ Ap. Combefis.
² Alexandri Lycopolitæ ex Ethnico Manichæi, atque inde ad ecclesiam reducti liber.—Videtur scripsisse sæculo quarto. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 290.

³ Erat quidem primum cultu

⁷ Vid. Assen.

⁸ Ph. contr.

⁴ Ph. contr.

⁵ Ph. contr.

⁶ Ph. contr.

^a Ph. contr.

^b Ph. contr.

^c Ph. contr.

Gentilis, deinde ad Manichæos in Egyptum recens delatos se contulit. Tandem ejurata hæresi, ad Catholicorum castra transit. Cav. Diss. de scriptor. incerta. ætatis. ⁷ Phot. contr. Manich. ubi supra. ⁸ Beauf. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 236. ^a Tillem. T. iv. Les Manichéens Art. 16. fin.

pear hereafter. Cassiodorus commends Augustine's writings ^b against the Manichees, as if they were superior to what he had written against other heretics.

4. But there are two catholic writers against the Manichees, Serapion and Titus, of whom I shall here give a distinct account. Their books against the Manichees being their only remaining works, I shall write their history in this place, and observe their testimony to the books of the New Testament.

Serapion, mentioned by ^c Epiphanius and ^d Heracleian among authors who before them had written against the Manichees, is placed by Jerom in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers; where he speaks of him to this purpose: 'Serapion ^e, bishop of Thmuis, who for his great capacity was called Scholasticus, and was much esteemed by the monk Antonius, published an excellent book against the Manichees, another upon the Titles of the Psalms, and useful epistles to divers persons; and under the emperor Constantius he was famous as a confessor.'

Cave ^f speaks of Serapion at the year 347, about which time he is supposed to have been made bishop of Thmuis by Athanasius. Basinge, editor of Serapion's ^g book against the Manichees, placeth him at 340; Cave says he died about the year 358; Valesius ^h says he died before the year 359; but Tillemont, who thinks ⁱ he was made bishop about 349, makes a question whether ^h he was not alive in the year 369; Socrates ^j says that about the year 373 Athanasius sent five bishops, and among them Serapion of Thmuis, to wait upon the emperor Constantius in the west.

It has been observed by learned men that Thmuis in the Egyptian language signifies a goat: the city was so called because that animal was the great object of its worship; Jerom says as much ^m in his Commentary upon the forty-sixth chapter of Isaiah.

It is commonly said that Serapion was a great ascetic, and for a good while lived a mortified course of life in the deserts of Thebais. Cave ⁿ goes into this supposition; but Tillemont dis-

^a Contra quos ita fervore pietatis incanduit, ut diligentius atque vivacius adversus eos dixerit, quam contra hæreses alias differuit. Cass. de Institut. D. L. c. i. p. 510, T. 2. ^c H. 66. c. 21.

^e Ap. Phot. cod. 85, p. 204.

^f Serapion Thmues episcopus, qui ob elegantiam ingenii cognomen Scholastici meruit, charus Antonii monachi, edidit adversus Manichæum egregium librum, et de Psalmorum titulis alium, et ad diversos utiles epistolas. Et sub Constantio prin-

cipe etiam in confessione inclutus fuit. De V. I. cap. 99. ^g Cav. H. L. ^h Ap.

Canis. Antiq. Lect. T. i. ⁱ Annot. in libr. iv. c. 23. Socr. p. 54, b.

^j Saint Athanas. Art. 66. Mem. Ec. T. 8. P. i. p. 241. ^k Ib. p. 243.

^l Socrat. H. E. l. 4, c. 9, p. 547, C.

^m Θμους lingua Ægyptia ab hirco. In. II. T. 3, p. 343, m. ⁿ Vitæ instituto

αρετης, inter arctioris disciplinæ cultores diu deserta Thebaidos habitavit. Cav. ubi supr.

putes it: for he says that ° the attainments of learning and eloquence, ascribed to Serapion by Jerom and Sozomen, are not the things for which hermits are wont to be commended; nor do those writers any where say that he ever lived such a course of life, though they have mentioned him several times.

Antonius's respect for this bishop of Thmuis is taken notice of by P Athanasius, who also himself had a great regard for him, and addressed q several of his works to him in epistles.

In Sozomen, Serapion has the character r of a man of admirable piety and eloquence; and his name is in s Jerom's letter to Magnus. Socrates has preserved a memorable saying of our author, taken from from Euagrius of Pontus: 'The t angel of the church of Thmuis said: "the soul that has drunk in spiritual knowledge is completely cleansed; the parts of the soul fretted with anger are cured by love, and other evil affections are corrected by temperance."

No work of Serapion remains beside his book against the Manichees, which is not very large.

As for his testimony to the books of the New Testament, I observe briefly, that he has quoted the gospels, the u Acts of the apostles, and divers of St. Paul's epistles, particularly that x to the Hebrews, as his; he quotes the epistle to the Romans y as an oracle, and z in like manner other parts of scripture.

The reader may perhaps here recollect that a we formerly saw the history of another bishop of this place named Phileas, who suffered martyrdom in the persecution begun by Dioclesian.

5. I shall be obliged to cite Titus of Bostra several times; I therefore here write likewise his history: says Jerom, ' Titus b, bishop of Bostra, in the time of Julian and Jovian, wrote with great strength of argument against the Manichees, and some other volumes: he died under Valens.' This last mentioned emperor reigned from 364 to 378: Titus is remembered again by Jerom in his letter to Magnus.

According to Cave, Titus flourished about 362, and died about 371; in Bafnage's edition he is placed as writing about the

° Note 70, Sur. S. Athan. ubi supr. T.

8, p. 1179, P De Vit. S. Anton. p.

856, n. 82, p. 864, n. 91. q Vid. Athan.

Opp. p. 340, &c. p. 647, &c. r antr

es ta malita ton bin deapinos, kai legem

dimos. Sozom. l. 4, c. 9, p. 547.

s —et Serapionis confessoris. Hier.

Ep. 83.

t —οτι ους μεν πεποικως

πνευματικη γνωσι τελειως καθαιρεται αγα

πη δε τα φλεγμανοντα μορια τε θυμω δε

ραπειναι, ποτηρας δε επιθυμιας επιρριπτας

εγχειν εγκρατεια. ap. Socr. l. 4, c. 23,

p. 237, C. u Serap. contr. Manich. p.

47, l. x οταν λεγη παυλος Πιστι μααδ

η πορη η ανιατωλετο τοις ακυβητασι. p.

46, m. y τα δε λογια βωοντα και λεγοντα.

p. 47, supr. m. z και βωοντι οι λογοι. p.

47, infr. m. a See p. 352.

b Titus Bostrenus episcopus sub Juliano

et Joviano principibus fortes adversum

Manichæos scripsit libros, et nonnulla vo-

lumina alia. Moritur autem sub Valente,

De V. I. c. 102.

year 360: Tillemont thinks that ^c he published his books against the Manichees in the reign of Valens.

Titus fell under the displeasure of Julian, of which Sozomen has left the following account: 'Julian ^d ordered the people of 'Bosra to expel the bishop of that church by a public decree, 'and threatened them, that if any disturbance happened there 'he should impute it to the bishop and clergy. Titus thereupon 'sent a letter to the emperor, assuring him that the Christians 'were equal in number to the Greeks [or Gentiles]; that they 'were very quiet; and that, paying a regard to his admonitions, 'they had no thought of making any disturbance. From those 'words Julian took occasion to write a letter to the people of Bos- 'tra, in order to incense them against Titus, as having accused 'them, saying: "It was not owing to their own good temper, "but to his exhortations, that they were kept from sedition." The letter, or rescript of Julian, still ^e extant, confirms Sozo- men's account.

The books of Titus against the Manichees are taken notice of by many ancient authors; as ^f Epiphanius, ^g Theodoret, ^h He- racleon, ⁱ Stephen Gobar, ^k Photius; as also by ^l Trithemius; beside Jerom above transcribed.

We still have three of those books, with the contents of all four; but the fourth and last seems to be irrecoverably lost: and there may be reason to think that the three books which we have are not complete, or that some parts of them are out of place. It seems to me that some words of ^m Basnage, to whom we are in- debted for the publication of Titus in Greek, afford ground for such a suspicion, though he has taken laudable pains to set all right.

Some ascribe to Titus a Commentary upon St. Luke, though it is not distinctly mentioned among his works by any ancient author; learned men therefore are divided in their sentiments about it. Basnage thinks that ⁿ Titus wrote such a commentary,

^c Persecution de Julien, Art. 25, Mem. T. 7, p. 669.

^d Sozom. l. 5, c. 15, p. 616, B. C. D.

^e Vid. Julian. Opp. T. i. p. 435, Ep.

52. ^f Har. 66, c. 21.

^g Har. Fab. l. i. c. 26, sub. fin.

^h Ap. Phot. cod. 85. ⁱ Ap. eund. cod. 232, p. 396.

^k Contr. Manich. l. i. cap. xi. ^l De Script. Ec. cap. 72.

^m Quinimo plurima inverso ordine tur- tota intricatissima invenimus. Prima fronte perisse librum tertium autumabam. — Sed perlegendis Graeca, apparuit nobis ille liber tertius integer, quem primo

libro inseruerat amanuensis. Deinde truncatus multis in locis videbatur primus liber. Sed discepta rescire, et in genuinum ordinem restituere conati sumus, non modo argumentorum seriem secuti, sed etiam proposito Serapionis scopo, quem ipse delineaverat, sequentes. Bas- nag. Animadv. ap. Canis. Lect. T. i. p. 58. ⁿ Observandum est igitur, perisse Commentarios Titi in Lucam, sed frag- menta tantum, sive Catenam Graecorum Patrum sub ejus nomine protrudi. Basn. ib. p. 57.

and that there are fragments of it remaining: Fabricius is of opinion, that ° the Commentary upon St. Luke is the work of some other Titus, of the sixth century, or later: Tillemont, beside other material things, observes that ^p no ancient author makes particular mention of any work of Titus, but that against the Manichees; and that the Commentary upon St. Luke, which bears his name, has divers marks of a late age.

I shall add here some censures of learned moderns upon Titus; particularly upon that work of his which we have, and is universally received as genuine. Those censures may be of use to assist my readers in forming a right judgment of ancient Christian writers.

Says ^a Tillemont: ‘He seems to have followed the dangerous error ascribed to Origen, that the pains of the damned, and even those of the dæmons themselves, will not be eternal.’

Du Pin ^r says: ‘It is surprising that Titus had not recourse to original sin for explaining all the difficulties of the Manichees: it might have served him for a general solution of almost all their objections: for there is no longer any difficulty to comprehend, why man is carried to evil, why he suffers, why he is subject to hunger, pain, diseases, death, when once original sin is admitted: nevertheless, he has made no use of this doctrine to explain these questions, but examines them like a philosopher. He has not so much as mentioned the grace of Jesus Christ, and he seems to have supposed that man can of himself do good as well as evil.’

James Basnage, the first editor of Titus in Greek and Latin, speaks ^s to the like purpose. And indeed it is commonly said that ^t Augustine himself, in his books against the Manichees, spoke of man’s free-will just as Titus and Didymus, and other Greeks did.

I ought now briefly to observe this writer’s testimony to the books of the New Testament. He frequently quotes the gospels, and the epistles of St. Paul, particularly that to the Hebrews: he

° Commentarius in Lucan sub Titi nomine editus—non est huius Titi, sed scriptoris Cyrillo Alexandrino, ac fortasse seculo sexto junioris, &c. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. 8, p. 413. ^p Vid. Tillem. ubi supra, p. 670. ^q Tillem. ubi supra, p. 671.

^r Du Pin Bibl. des Aut. Ec. T. 2, p. 128, a Amsterdam. ^s Non modo sinit de peccato originali, quo facile necessitatem et aequitatem penarum firmare poterat;

sed virtutem a rationis exercitatione hominisque electione pendere absque ulla Christi gratia affirmabat. Basn. ap. Camif. Lect. T. i. p. 57. ^t Libertatem arbitrii tam ad bonum quam ad malum homini lapsi tribuit [Didymus]: nec mirum, omnes enim adversus Manichæos disputantes, ne Augustino quidem excepto, hanc sententiam propugnaverunt. Id. ib. p. 199.

quotes ^a the first words of the epistle, and afterwards, in another place, a ^x large part of the first chapter, expressly as Paul's.

In one ^y short paragraph he quotes the beginning of St. Matthew's and St. Mark's gospels, and the sixth and seventh verses of the first chapter of St. John, and cites all those several evangelists by name.

Titus likewise quotes ^z the Acts of the apostles. I shall have occasion to take particular notice of the passage hereafter.

He has little or nothing out of the catholic epistles, or the Apocalypse.

I have observed in this author these general divisions of scripture; 'the ^a law and the prophets:' 'the ^b law, the gospel, and 'Paul:' and presently afterwards, 'the ^c law, our Saviour, and 'the apostle:' often, 'law ^d and gospel' for Old and New Testament.

His respect for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament is manifest; I need not allege particular passages. At the beginning of his work he says: 'We ^e learn the way of truth from 'the holy scriptures and the common principles of reason.'

6. This is not a proper time or place for me to give a distinct account of Didymus of Alexandria, who flourished about the year 370, though we still have ^f a tract against the Manichees, and in it's original Greek language, which is generally allowed to be ^g his.

I shall only say that here are no hard names. Didymus must have been naturally of a mild temper; or the principles of reason and religion had softened him, and produced in him gentleness and long-suffering: upon this account, as well as others, this piece deserves to be commended. This character belongs to so few writings in the Manichæan controversy, that one cannot forbear taking notice of it. Most other authors with their arguments have mingled bitter invectives, and the harshest expressions that can be thought of. In such kind of language none have exceeded that polite and orthodox writer Photius, patriarch of Constantinople: and honest Serapion, at the beginning of his work, naming Valentinus and Marcion, and some other ancient here-

^a Και ο παυλος ουδ'—γραφειν μεν εθελουσις αιτιας λαγει' Πολυμυριως και πολυτροπως, κ. λ. Tit. contr. Manich. l. 3. ap. Canis. Lect.

T. i. p. 142. ^x Ib. p. 153.

^y Ib. p. 141. ^z Ib. p. 155.

^a Τωσαιτην γυν επιμελειαν τε νομω και τωι τε φηται πεποινηται ο σωτης, κ. λ. l. 3, p. 140.

^b Επειν ο νομος—εντε το παγγελιοι—εβοσεν ο παυλος.—ib. p.

153, 154.

^c Και ιεροισται—εν νομω, και

σωτης, και αποσολη. ib. p. 153.

^d Vid. ib. p. 154. in.

^e ΑΛΛ' ΑΥΤΗΝ ΤΗΣ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΣ ΤΗΝ ΟΟΝ, ΕΝΤΕ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ ΓΡΑΦΩΝ, ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΚΟΙΝΩΝ ΕΝΟΜΩΝ ΕΧΟΥΤΕΣ. l. i. p. 60.

^f ap. Basnag. Canis. Lect. p. 204, &c.

^g Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. in Didymo. Basnag. ap. Canis. lect. p. 203. Tillem. Mem.

Ec. T. x. Didyme, Art. iv. in fin. Fabr.

Fib. Gr. T. 8, p. 353.

tics, affirms that 'the ^b Manichæan wickedness and absurdity ' had so far outgone all other things of the kind, as to make ' them appear almost innocent.' Eppiphanius ⁱ calls this the most venomous of all heresies; and to the like purpose speaks ^k Cyril. However, it must be owned that hard names have been given to all sorts of heretics; nor is it easy to say which is the worst heresy: perhaps men are apt to think that so which they are opposing. Athanasius ^l represents Arianism as the most impious of all heresies, not excepting the Manichees; for they, and the Valentinians, are expressly named by him just before.

7. All these beforementioned writers and others are in Fabricius. But I think it not amiss to take notice here of some authors omitted in his Catalogue:

1. The anonymous author of A History of the Heresy of the Manichees; a small piece published by Mr. Pfaff with the Epitome of Lactantius.

2. The anonymous author De Vera Circumcisione, in the appendix to St. Jerom's works, more than once opposeth the Manichees ^m. A distinct account of this piece was given ⁿ formerly.

3. Arius deserved a place in that Catalogue, if upon no other account, for the sake of the early mention of the Manichæan doctrine concerning ^o the Son, in a letter written before the council of Nice.

4. Nor has Fabricius got Chrysostom, though that great orator often touches upon this point. Montfauçon thought it somewhat remarkable that he did so frequently oppose this error; and therefore takes particular notice of it in ^p his prefaces to several of the volumes of St. Chrysostom's works.

5. St. Jerom likewise frequently mentions and argues against the Manichees. I shall often quote him in writing their history.

6. Pelagius, in his Commentaries upon St. Paul's epistles, confutes them several ^q times.

^b Τελειωταιν δε εν τρωα της ποτηρας, πασαις τας αλλας ποτηρας δυτερως αποδειξασα, η τα μαυχαρια προηλθε μαχα. κ. λ. Serap. contr. Manich. p. 44, m. ⁱ Μετα την μοχηραν ταυτην, και υνδλον υπερ πασαν αιρεσιν και ζεπιτωδη τα μαυ, — Σερβολιαν. — H. 97, n. i. ^k Vid. Cyr. Cat. 16, n. 9, p. 247. ^l Οι δε αριανοι των

μεν αλλων αιρεσεων εισι πολυτροτεροι, και μικροστις αε αυτων αδελφας αποδειξαν κενους, πλεον αυταις ασεβοντες. Ath. Hist. Arian. ad Mon. T. i p. 384, A.

^m —quam [vitam] Manichæi non videntes in carne, Ariani non intelligentes in spiritu. — ap. Hieron. opp. T. v. p. 254, et passim. ⁿ See p. 217, 218. ^o — — — — —

^p — — — — —

πατρος το γενημα εισηγησατο. Ap. Epiph. H. 69, c. 7. ^p Anomæorum impietatem

sepe oppugnat et insectatur Chrysostomus. — Sed, quod fortasse miretur quispiam, sapius in Manichæos invehitur. — Licet enim hæc hæresis non tantas turbas daret, quantas haud ita pridem dederant Anomæi, attamen magno illi numero erant, malumque serpebat in dies satius. Pref. ad Chryf. T. 7, n. iii. ^q Verum totus hic locus contra Manichæos facit, ubi dicit, quod evangelium ante sit promissum

—et quod Christus secundum carnem ex David stirpe. Pelag. in Ep. ad Rom. c. i. ver. 1, 2, ap. Hieron. opp. T. v. p. 926. Vid. et p. 928, et 931.

7. Rufinus, upon the Creed, distinctly censures the Manichees, together with divers others called heretics.

8. To all these and others might be added, from Asseman, divers Syrian authors.

1. The ^r Edeffen Chronicle.

2. Ephrem, placed by Cave at the year 370, who in his work against all heresies ^s particularly attacked the Manichees.

3. Asseman mentions several others, whose ^t names are in the margin.

III. All these names of eminent writers upon this point are sufficient to assure us that there were Manichees in many parts of the world; but it does not appear that they were any where numerous: this may be perceived from St. Augustine, who had occasion to be well acquainted with them. He says to them: 'You' are a very few, and almost none at all:' and adds, that though good men were scarce, there were vastly more truly good men among the catholics than all the Manichees, whether good or bad. They sometimes argued that they were the few whom our Lord speaks of as walking in the narrow way that leads to life: but Augustine cautions them ^s against being deceived by such an argument, however specious it might appear. In another place he magnifies ^v the number of the catholics above the small number of their sect. He says that ^z Fortunatus, a Manichæan presbyter, seduced people enow at Hippo to induce him to live there a good while; which, however, I think, does not lead us to suppose that the number of his converts was very great. I need not insist on any more passages of Augustine where ^a he speaks of their small number.

IV. Fabricius has likewise a catalogue ^b of the names of Ma-

^r Ap. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 393.

^s Refellit S. Doctor omnes generationem hereses, speciatim autem Bardefanis, Marcionis, et Manichæi. Assem. ib. p. 118. Conf. T. 3, P. i. p. 63.

^t Hinc adverius eam sectam, præter Græcos et Latinos patres, Syri complures scripserunt; Ephraem, Paulonas, Daniel Rhodina, Natanael, et Bud Periodeutes, de quibus Sobensis in hoc catalogo. Ib. T. 3, P. i. p. 220.

^v Quid autem inter vos, in tam exiguo et pene nullo numero vestro, nonne plerique sunt tales——? Quæ tamen paucitas sanctorum et fidelium——per se ipsam tantam massam frumenti facit, ut omnes probos et reprobos vestros, quos pariter veritas reprobatur, incomparabili multitudine superet. Contr. Faust. l. 20, c. 23.

^a Fuge ista, obsecro, non te decipiat

species paucitatis, quoniam ipse Dominus dixit, angustam viam esse paucorum. Contr. Secundin. cap. 26.

^y ——velitisque intelligi in tanta vestra paucitate latere nescio quos, qui sua præcepta custodiunt, et in tanta catholice multitudinis non velitis? De Mor. Manich. cap. ult. fin.

^z Eodem tempore presbyterii mei, contra Fortunatum quemdam Manichæorum presbyterum disputavi, qui plurimum temporis apud Hipponem vixerat, seduxeratque tam multos, ut propter illos ibi eum delectaret habitare. Retr. l. 2, c. 14.

^a Cum in ista paucitate magnas patiamini angustias, dum a vobis exigitur vel unus ex iis quos electos vocatis, qui præcepta illa custodiat. De Mor. Ec. Cath. c. 34.

^b Ap. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 287—289.

Manichees mentioned by ancient writers. I shall take notice of a few only.

1. Here again occurs Alexander of Lycopolis; of whom I need not say any thing more than I have done.

2. Augustine, a wit of the first order, and a principal glory of the country of Africa, who was entangled in this opinion, and for about nine years was among the auditors of the Manichees, from the nineteenth to the twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth year of his age; at which time suspicions concerning the truth of their doctrine arose in his mind, and increased, until he quite forsook them. Afterwards he wrote against them at several times with great applause and success.

I have expressed myself with no greater exactness concerning the time of Augustine's being in the Manichæan scheme, because he himself speaks differently: sometimes his expression is that he was with them ^c almost nine years, at another time ^d full nine years: sometimes he says that when the difficulties of their scheme perplexed him, he was ^e in the twenty-eighth, at other times ^f in the twenty-ninth, year of his age; nay he speaks of his being ^g in the thirtieth year of his age, or almost thirty years old, before his eyes were opened.

The reason of this different way of speaking seems to be that his change was gradual: for the space of nine years, or very near it, from the nineteenth year of his life, he was entirely ^h theirs; in the twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth year of his age doubts arose in his mind; about the end of which last year ⁱ he seems to have determined to be no longer a Manichee: in the next year, the thirtieth of his life, when his mother came to him at Milan,

^c Nam novem ferme anni secuti sunt, quibus ego in illo limo profundi ac tenebris falsitatis,—volutatus sum. Confess. l. 3, c. xi. n. 20. Et per annos ferme novem, quibus eos animo vagabundus audivi, nimis extento desiderio expectabam istum Faustum. ib. l. 5, c. vi. n. 10. Quid enim me aliud cogebat, annos fere novem,—homines illos sequi ac diligenter audire—? De Util. Cred. cap. i. n. 2.

^d Novem annos totos magna cura et diligentia vos audivi. De Mor. Manich. c. 19, n. 68.

^e Per idem tempus annorum novem, ab undevicesimo anno ætatis meæ, usque ad duodetricesimum seducebamur et seducebamur. Confess. l. 4, c. i.

^f Proloquar in conspectu Dei mei annum illum unde trigesimum ætatis meæ. Jam venerat Carthaginem quidam Manichæorum episcopus Faustus nomine, &c. Confess. l. 5, c. 3.

^g Et ecce jam tri-

cenariam ætatem gerebam, in eodem luto hæsitans,—dum dico, Cras inveniam. Ecce manifestum apparebit, et tenebo. Ecce Faustus veniet, et exponet omnia. Confess. l. 6, c. xi. n. 18.

^h Audite doctos ecclesiæ catholicæ viros tanta pace animi, et eo voto quo ego vos audivi: nihil opus erit novem annis, quibus me ludificastis. Longe omnino, longe brevior tempore, quid intersit inter veritatem vanitatemque cernetis. De M. E. C. cap. 18, n. 34.

ⁱ Dubitans de omnibus, atque inter omnia fluctuans, Manichæos quidem relinquendos esse decrevi: non arbitrans eo tempore dubitationis meæ in illa secta mihi permanendum esse.—Statui ergo tandiu esse catechumenus in catholica ecclesiâ, mihi a parentibus commendata, donec aliquid certi eluceret, quocursum dirigerem. Confess. l. 5, c. ult. n. 25.

he

he was
not yet
and it
baptiz

Wh
interest
opinion
them a
nianus,

3. A
a book
that the
words,
and the
August
where c
Testam

In a
Manich
mistak
tween
reason
Cyril,
iations

Et
gravior
sed tam
quidem
catolice
n. 1.

quod au
trum c
rectum
cum lig
c. 3. n.

duceban
etiam cu
deceptis
CP. 4.

et, am
continue
putabat

L. 11.
fisione,
desidera
ad Rom

Te
meo, c
ve ad
expone
cap. 1.

p. 61.

he was only ^k not a Manichee; nay, in his thirty-first year he had not yet ^l a clear notion of the origin of natural and moral evil; and it was not till the thirty-third year of his age that he was baptized.

Whilst Augustine was among the Manichees he promoted their interest considerably, and ^m brought over divers to the same opinion; men of good condition, and bright parts, and some of them addicted to a studious course of life: as ⁿ Alypius, ^o Romanianus, and ^p Honoratus.

3. Adimantus, said to have been a disciple of Mani, wrote ^q a book against the law and the prophets, endeavouring to shew that the gospels and epistles were contrary to them; or, in other words, the disagreement between the Old and New Testament, and that consequently the former could not be of God. This book Augustine confuted in a distinct piece, still extant; and he ^r elsewhere occasionally confutes this writer's objections against the Old Testament.

In another place he says that ^s Adimantus was that disciple of Manichee who was also called Addas. Beaufobre ^t thinks this a mistake of Augustine, because the Greek writers distinguish between Addas and Adimantus: but perhaps Augustine had good reason for what he said. Toutée, the Benedictine editor of St. Cyril, assents ^u to Augustine; as does ^x Tillemont, without hesitation. Cave supposed ^y Addas and Adimantus to have been

^k Et invenit me periclitantem quidem graviter desperatione indagandæ veritatis. sed tamen cum ei indicassem, non me quidem jam esse Manichæum, sed neque catholicum Christianum.—Ib. l. 6, c. i. n. 1.

^l Et intendebar ut cererner quod audiebam, liberum voluntatis arbitrium causam esse ut male faceremus, et rectum judicium tuum ut pateremur, et cum liquide cernere non valebam. ib. l. 7, c. 3, n. 5.

^m —seducebamur et seducebamur—et sectabar ista atque faciebam cum amicis meis, per me ac mecum deceptis. Confess. l. 4, cap. i. Vid. ib. cap. 2, n. 7.

ⁿ Et audire me rursus incensus, illi mecum superstitione involutus et, amans in Manichæis ostentationem continentie, quam veram et germanam putabat. Conf. l. 6, c. 7, n. 12, vid. ib. l. 11.

^o Ipsa me penitus ab illa superstitione, in quam te mecum precipitem dederam, liberavit. Contr. Academicos, ad Roman. l. 1, c. i. n. 3.

^p Tu nondum Christianus, qui hortatu meo, cum eos vehementer execraberis, ex adductus es, ut audiendi tibi atque exponendi viderentur.—De Util. Cred. cap. 1, n. 2.

^q Eodem tempore vene-

runt in manus meas quædam disputationes Adimanti, qui fuerat Manichæi discipulus, quas conscripsit adversus legem et prophetas, velut contraria eis evangelica et apostolica scripta demonstrare conatus. Huic ego respondi. Aug. Retract. l. i. c. 22.

^r Vid. Aug. in Psalm. Serm. 12, cap. i.

^s Jam illud aliud quod in eodem codice scribi coeperat, Adimanti opus est, illius discipuli Manichæi, qui prænomine Addas dictus est: ubi de utroque Testamento velut inter se contraria testimonia proferantur versipelli dolositate.—Aug. Contr. Adv. Leg. et Proph. l. 2, cap. ult. n. 41.

^t Beauf. ib. T. i. p. 432, not. (6.)

^u Vid. Cyril. Cat. vi. c. 13, not. (3.)

^x Mem. T. iv. Les Manich. Art. 14, in.

^y Diversus ab Adda nostro erat Adimantus ille, cuius toties apud Augustinum occurrit mentio, quemque ipse peculiari opere refutavit. In catalogo enim discipulorum Manetis, tum apud Petrum Siculum, tum apud formulæ Cotlerianæ et Tollianæ auctorem distincte recensentur, etsi in alia sententia me olim fuisse fateor, et mecum ipse Augustinus. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 145.

two different persons: I put his words at the bottom of the page. I shall hereafter take some farther notice of the names of those who are said to have been disciples of Mani.

Adimantus is much admired by ^z Faustus; he is next in his esteem to Mani himself, which Augustine ^a fails not to observe: Beaufobre therefore concludes that ^b Adimantus was the apostle of Mani, who planted Manichæism in Africa: but to me this appears a conjecture without foundation. Augustine has ^c often mentioned this man, but says nothing of that kind of him. He says he ^d was a disciple of Mani, and much extolled, as having been an eminent teacher of that sect; and ^e that it was commonly said he was a follower of Mani in his lifetime: but he no where intimates that they gave out that Africa was indebted to Adimantus for his presence or personal instructions.

If Adimantus and Addas be two names of one and the same person, as Augustine supposed, it may be reckoned very probable that he was a disciple of Mani in his lifetime, or however one of the most early abettors of his principles afterwards: for according to the Dispute ascribed to Archelaus, the three chief disciples of Mani were ^f Thomas, Addas and Hermas: in Cyril ^g their names are Thomas, Baddas, and Hermas; in Epiphanius ^h Thomas, Hermias, Addas; in Theodoret ⁱ Aldas, (by mistake of transcribers probably for Addas,) Thomas and Hermas. I need not add any more authors.

Whether Adimantus be the same person as Addas or not, it is fit I should take notice of what Photius writes in his extracts out of Heracleon. 'That ^k author said that Diodorus of Tarsus, in 'his first seven books, really argued against a work of Addas, 'called Modion, whilst he thought he had been overthrowing 'the living gospel of Manichee himself.' That title is supposed to have been taken from Mark iv. 21.

Here then is a book of Addas; was it the same with that of Adimantus, confuted by Augustine? We cannot be absolutely

^z — a doctissimo scilicet et solo nobis post beatum patrem nostrum Manichæum studendo [al. stupendo] Adimanto. Faust. l. i. c. 2, ap. August. T. 8.

^a Faustus sic miratur Adimantum, ut ei solum præferat Manichæum. Contr. Faust. l. 6, c. 6. ^b Beauf. ib. T. i. p. 433.

^c Contr. Adimant. c. 12, n. 2, c. 13, n. 1, et 4, et passim.

^d Quid quod etiam insultare ausus est populo Israel Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichæi, quem magnum doctorem illius sectæ fuisse commemorant. Contr. Adim. c. 12, n. 2.

^e Si autem recenseatis quæ contra Faust-

tum Manichæum scripsimus, et contra Adimantum, qui Manichæi sectator cum ille viveret fuisse jactatur. — Contr. Adv. Leg. et Pr. c. 12.

^f Acquisivit etiam discipulos tres, quorum nomina sunt hæc, Thomas, Addas, et Hermas. Arch. Disp. c. 53, p. 98. ^g Cat. vi. c. 31, p. 107. ^h Har. 66, c. v. et xii.

ⁱ Har. Fab. l. i. c. 26, p. 214, C.

^k ὅς διὰ τῶν πρῶτων βιβλίων ἐπὶ τῇ μανιχαῖᾳ ζῶν εὐαγγέλιον ἀνατρέπει ^h τὸ γὰρ δι' αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἀνατρέπει τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῇ γράμματι, οὐ καλεῖται μόδιον. Cod. 85, p. 204.

certain;

p. 66.

certain; but possibly it was. The book used in Africa might be a Latin translation of the Greek original; and Addas might be more generally called Adimantus by the Latins, as Mani himself, who for the most part is called Manes by the Greeks, is generally called Manichæus by the Latins. We saw before that Adimantus and his book were much esteemed by the Manichees in Africa. If what Heracleon says of Diodorus of Tarsus be true, we have also proof of the great regard paid to the book of Addas in Asia; it must have been common there and in high esteem; otherwise Diodorus had not allotted his first seven books to the confutation of it, and that upon the supposition of it's being Mani's gospel.

Heracleon ascribes a like mistake to ¹ Titus of Bosra. I rather think that Titus was not mistaken: he knew well enough whom he argued against; but he reckoned it to be one and the same thing to confute the master or a chief disciple. The objections he answered were sometimes taken from Mani himself, sometimes from Addas; but he did not judge it needful expressly to distinguish his authors. Titus has himself more than once intimated, that ^m he argued against somebody beside Mani himself, though he does not name the author. However here is another proof of the commonness of the book of Addas, and of the esteem it was in.

Possibly this book was not always fully titled, or inscribed, exactly in the same manner: and Augustine, a Latin in Africa, might mean, and have before him, the same book that was used by Diodorus and Titus; though he does not call it the Modion of Addas, but Dissertations of Adimantus.

Upon the whole, I think it probable that Addas and Adimantus are only two names of one and the same person; and that the book of Adimantus, which (as appears from Faustus and Augustine) was famous in Africa, is the same with that of Addas, which was used by the Manichees in Asia. In short, this book was every where considered by that sect as one of the best books they had; and I wish we had it too.

4. We are indebted to Photius for the knowledge of another Manichæan writer named Agapius; but his age is uncertain. Photius says that ⁿ Agapius seems to oppose the error of Eunomius, who flourished about the year 360. But those words need not be understood to mean any more than ^o that his sentiments were different from those of Eunomius, inasmuch that he seemed to oppose them: as indeed it is allowed that the Manichæan

¹ Phot. Cod. 85. ^m — ως γε ταυτην πεντοτολμας. Ib. l. 3, p. 137.

αυτου συγγραψαν φησιν, — Tit. contr.

Manich. l. i. p. 71, infr. m. — φησι δε

τις εκεινος, η αλλος τις των απ' εκεινου,

αποφαινε το κεραιαιον περι της ανθρωπινης

ⁿ Μαχιστα δε δοκει προς την ευνομην να-
κοδευειν. Cod. 179, p. 405. ^o Vid.

Cav. Diss. de scriptor. incert. æt. et Beauf.

Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 434.

doctrine concerning the trinity was different from that of the Arians.

However, what Photius says ^p of this writer's confessing a substantial trinity, and agreeing mightily in expression with the orthodox Christians, may be an argument for his having lived and written after the Nicene council; forasmuch as it is very common with Photius to find in ecclesiastical authors, who lived before that council, many forms of expression different from those in use afterwards.

Photius speaks of a piece, or, as he is generally understood, of two pieces of ^q Agapius; one a work of three-and-twenty books, another consisting of a hundred-and-two chapters, inscribed to a woman of the same sect named Urania: but perhaps that is a fictitious name and character. If those books were extant they would be very curious. It may be collected from the account which Photius gives of them, that they would have furnished us with a good knowledge of the Manichæan scheme; for most, if not all their principles, seem to have been there treated.

In another work Photius, reckoning up the twelve disciples of Mani, mentions ^r Agapius, author of the Heptalogus, as does likewise ^s Peter of Sicily: this book is also in the ^t Anathemas against the Manichees, or Form of abjuring Manichæism. Timothy, presbyter of Constantinople, mentions, perhaps by mistake, the ^u Heptalogus of Alogius: it is generally supposed that ^v this is another book of the same Agapius, who wrote the other two beforementioned: if so, Agapius wrote three books in defence of the Manichæan principles. Whether this computation be right I cannot tell; but I can by no means allow that the placing Agapius among the twelve disciples of Mani affords any help for settling this age; because I do not admit the authority of the Catalogues in Photius and Peter, and the Anathemas just quoted; the reasons will be assigned hereafter.

5. Philostorgius tells a story of ^y Aphonius at Alexandria, whom he speaks of as a bishop of the Manichees, and a man in great reputation for knowledge and eloquence. Ætius, he says, had a public disputation with Aphonius, and so entirely over-

^p Καὶ τριάδα θεομορσίον ὁ καταρατὸς λέγει μὲν ομολογεῖν. Cod. 179, p. 404, in. τὰς μὲν τὰν εὐσεβῶν λέξεις συνομολογῶν. ib. infr. p. m.

^q — ἀγαπίου βιβλίον, δοχολόγια περιέχον τρία καὶ εἰκοσι, καὶ ἑτέρα κεφάλαια εἰκοσι δύο καὶ ἑκατόν. Cod. 179, p. 401.

^r — καὶ ἀγαπίου, ὁ τῆν ἑπτάλογον καλεῖται συγγραφεύς. Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 14. ^s Pet. Sic. de Manich. ap. B. P. P. T. 16, p. 758, B. ^t Ap. Fabr.

Hippolyt. T. 2, p. 203, et Cotel. not. ad Recogn. Clem. l. 4. c. 27, et Toll. Insign. Ital. p. 142.

^u Vid. Timoth. in Fabr. Cod. Apocr. N. T. T. i. p. 138, 139, et Meurii Var. Divin. p. 117.

^v Vid. Cav. et Beauf. ubi supra.

^y Ἀφώνιος τις τῆς μανηχαίου ἡρώσεως πρεσβυτῆρος, καὶ μεγάλῃς παρὰ πολλοῖς ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ καὶ διανοίᾳ δογμάτων τῆν δόξαν. Philost. l. 3, c. 15, p. 487, 488.

came him that he died of grief seven days after. In the Catalogues of Photius and Peter of Sicily, and likewise in the Form of abusing Manichæism, before referred to, is the name of Athonius; and he is spoken of as one of Mani's commentators.

6. Faustus of Milevi ², in Africa, published a volume in defence of Manichæism, which St. Augustine answered ^a in a large work of three-and-thirty books, always prefixing at the beginning of each book a passage or section of Faustus himself. Beausobre commends this author's manner of writing, and supposeth that we have his work entire in Augustine; so does ^c Cave: but I do not perceive that clearly: we have the ^d introduction, but I do not see any conclusion. Augustine did not consider every thing in the book of Adimantus, but left a part of it near the end unanswered, as he acknowledges ^e in a work written long afterwards. Augustine wrote a book against Mani's epistle of the Foundation; but he therein confuted only the beginning of that epistle, as he informs us in his ^f Retractions. In like manner he may have been obliged, by the multitude of affairs upon his hands, to break off his answer to Faustus before he had confuted the whole of his book. It seems to me that Augustine, having followed Faustus step by step a great way, until he had produced and confuted ^g his furious passages concerning the gospels, supposed he might then put an end to his labours: I think that at the conclusion Augustine intimates he had considered some chapters only of ^h Faustus.

Of this writer Beausobre speaks farther to this purpose: 'We ^h might expect in this work of Faustus pure and genuine Manichæism: but beside that the African sect was one of the most absurd and heretical among them, Faustus treats but a small number of questions.' But, as before said, perhaps we have not his piece entire: and here again our desires may be raised for the works of Agapius, which seem to have been more full and

^a Faustus quidam fuit, gente Afer, civitate Milevitanus, eloquio suavis, ingenio callidus, secta Manichæus, ac per hoc nefando errore perversus. Noveram ipse hominem. — Aug. contr. Faust. l. i. c. 1.

^b Contra Faustum Manichæum — scripti grande opus, verbis ejus propositis reddens responsiones meas. Triginta et tres disputationes sunt, quas etiam libros cur non dixerim? Retract. l. 2, c. 7.

^c Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 224.

^d In quibus Faustum κατὰ πειράς sequitur, integrumque ejus librum in suum opus transcripsit. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 344, Oxon.

^e Vid. Faust. lib. i. ap. Aug.

^f Quamvis quædam sint per-

pauca in fine ipsius operis Adimanti, quibus non respondi; nescio quibus enim, ut fieri solet, incurrentibus, quæ magis videbantur urgere, illa interrupta sic remanserunt. Contr. Adv. Leg. et Pr. l. 2, c. 12, n. 41, fin.

^g Liber contra epistolam Manichæi, quam vocant fundamenti, principia ejus sola redarguit. Retr. l. 2, c. 2.

^h Vid. Faust. l. 32, et 33, ap. Aug. ⁱ Quapropter post omnes Fausti calumnias refutatas, dumtaxat horum ejus capitulorum, quibus hoc opere quantum Dominus adjuvare dignatus est, sufficienter, ut arbitror, prolixèque respondi, &c. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 33, c. 9.

^j Ib. p. 224.

copious. However, I shall be able to make good use of the work of Faustus, for shewing the Manichæan sentiments concerning the scriptures, and other matters.

Augustine insinuates that ⁱ Faustus was at first very poor, but that he lived well, and somewhat delicately, among the Manichees; notwithstanding the strict rules by which all the elect are bound to govern themselves. Augustine calls him ^k bishop: he speaks of the great esteem which Faustus was in among that people; but says that ^l, excepting his eloquence, there was little in him extraordinary; and that he was no more able than their other teachers, to remove the difficulties in the Manichæan scheme, which he then began to be sensible of. However, Augustine ^m has often commended Faustus's manner of speaking; and ⁿ owns that he was well qualified to make converts, and that he seduced many. He must have excelled in the art of speaking, or Augustine ^o had not given him the preference in that respect to Ambrose, the famous bishop of Milan, who had more learning, and was a good speaker likewise. Faustus and other Manichees ^p were banished into some island by the Roman proconsul; but it was not long before they were released. Tillemont ^q supposeth this to have happened in the year 386.

I cannot tell how it came to pass that in Fabricius it is said ^r Augustine heard Faustus nine years; when Augustine, in the place referred to, and elsewhere, assures us, that it was not till the ninth year of his being in the Manichæan sentiments that Faustus came to Carthage.

Faustus is spoken of by ^s Cave as flourishing at the year 400; but that is placing him too late. Augustine forsook the Manichees before he was quite thirty years of age; he became acquainted

ⁱ Et quia in mattis dormiunt, mattarii appellantur: a quorum stratis longe dissimiles fuerunt plumæ Fausti, et caprinæ lodices; qua deliciarum affluentia non solum mattarios fastidiebat, sed etiam domum patris sui hominis pauperis Milevitani. Contr. Faust. l. v. c. 5.

^k Jam venerat Carthaginem quidam Manichæorum episcopus Faustus nomine, magnus laqueus diaboli, et multi implicabantur in eo per illecebram suaviloquentiæ, quam ego tametsi laudabam, &c. Confess. l. 5, c. 3, n. 3.

^l —quæ mihi cunctatio in dies major oboriebatur, ex quo illum hominem, cujus nobis adventus, ut nosti, ad explicanda omnia, quæ nos movebant, quasi de cælo promittebatur, audiui, eumque excepta quadam eloquentia talem qualem ceteros cognovi. De Util. Cred. c. 8, n. 20.

^m Ergo ubi venit, expertus sum hominem gratum et jucundum verbis, et ea quæ illi solent dicere multo suavius garrulentem. Confess. l. 5, c. 6, n. 10.

ⁿ Vid. supr. not. ^k. ^o Et delectabar suavitate sermonis, quamquam eruditio- nis, minus tamen hilarescentis atque multo- centis quam Fausti erat, quod adinet ad dicendi modum: ceterum rerum ipsarum nulla comparatio. Confess. l. 5, c. 13, n. 23.

^p Faustus autem convictus vel confessus quod Manichæus esset cum aliis nonnullis secum ad iudicium proconsulare perductis, — in insulam relegatus est. Contr. Faust. l. 5, c. 8.

^q St. Augustin. Art. 18, Mem. T. 13, p. 43.

^r —et novem annos a se auditum testatur. Conf. l. 5, c. 6. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 288. ^s Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 344.

p. 75. with Faustus in his twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth year: at which time he speaks of Faustus as a bishop, and very famous in his party. If Augustine was born in 354, Faustus must have come to Carthage, and their acquaintance must have begun, in 382 or 383. Augustine's book against Faustus seems not to have been written till about the year 400; but the book of Faustus might be written a good while before, and he himself dead; as indeed I suspect he was from Augustine's manner of writing ^u at the beginning of his work and elsewhere. However, I willingly place Faustus at the year 384; though, according to the preceding argument, that is rather too late.

7. Hierax is reckoned among Manichæan writers by * Fabricius and Beaufobre. This last writer speaks of him in this manner: 'he ^y was an Egyptian, a native of Leontopolis, well skilled in the learning of the Greeks and Egyptians: he was not one of those extravagant Manichees that reviled the law and the prophets; and a great deal more, which I need not transcribe.

But, with submission, I see no reason to call Hierax, or Hieracas, a Manichee: that supposition depends upon the authority ^z of Photius, and Peter of Sicily, and the Anathemas, or Form of abjuring Manichæism, before taken notice of; where Hierax is named among the disciples and commentators of Mani. But they are all so late, that their testimony is of no weight against other evidence; for Photius and Peter are writers of the ninth century; and in their writings against the Manichees they so agree that it is ^a reckoned one copied the other; but which is the original is hard to say; and the Anathemas, as given us by Cotelierius and Tollius, plainly appear not to be of an earlier age. The composer of that form was acquainted with the Paulicians, and must have borrowed from Photius, or Peter, or both: in Tollius it is entitled 'A ^b Form of receiving those who are converted from the heresy of the Manichees and Paulicians to the true faith.' Beaufobre himself has somewhere well observed, upon another occasion, that things are not to be received upon the credit of pieces of so late age.

¹ Nam annum ætatis vicesimum nonum egit Carthagine cum Fausto. Libro enim 6 Confessionum cap. xi. scribit: Et ecce jam tricenariam ætatem gerebam.—Erat tunc annus Christi tricentesimus octogessimus tertius. Pagi in Baron. Ann. 377, n. 33.
^u Faustus quidem fuit gente Afer.
—Noveram ipse hominem, quemadmodum cum commemoravi in libris Confessionum mearum. Contr. Faust. l. i. c. 1.

* Bib. Gr. T. 5, p. 288.

Manich. T. i. p. 430, 431.

^z See Beauf. p. 430, not. (6.)

^a Quæ dum memoro, non possum non significare dubitationem, quam in notis professus sum, et in qua me adhuc hæzere fateor, uter scilicet horum alterum in scribendo imitatus videatur. Wolf. Præf. ad Phot. contr. Manich. p. 6.
^b Ap. Toll. Insign. Ital. p. 126.

^y Hist. de

Hierax has a great character in ^c Epiphanius for learning and piety: nevertheless he had, it seems, some errors which induced Epiphanius to consider him as an heretic; but he does not call him a follower of Mani: he makes a distinct heresy of his opinions: and in like manner ^d Augustine, ^e John Damascenus, and ^f Prædestinatus: nor do any of them insinuate that he borrowed any thing from Mani: and all of them, except Augustine (who has entirely omitted their sentiments concerning the scriptures) expressly say that the Hieracites received the Old and New Testament; particularly Epiphanius, briefly in his ^g Synopsis, and more largely in his ^h Panarium. The only ancient author, that I know of, who says the Hieracites rejected the Old Testament, is the anonymous author ⁱ against all heresies, among the works of Athanasius: nor are they any where charged with holding two principles. Philaster and Theodoret have nothing about them.

Hierax, it is true, is said to have denied the resurrection of the body, and ^k to have expected only a spiritual resurrection: but it does not appear that he took that opinion from Mani. Epiphanius expressly says he supposeth that Hierax learned it of Origen, or formed it out of his own (E) head.

In the letter of Arius to Alexander, as we have it in ^l Epiphanius, and ^m Athanasius in Greek, and in ⁿ Hilary in Latin, divers opinions concerning the Son are represented; that of Mani, Sabellius, and Hierax, all as different from each other.

If Hierax had been a Manichee, it would be very strange that ^o great numbers of the Egyptian monks, or ascetics, should admire and follow him, as Epiphanius says they did.

^c Hier. 67, n. 1. ^d De Har. c. 47.

^e *Χρημενοι δε παλαια και νεα διδωκη.* Dam. de Hæref. n. 67, ap. Cot. Monum. Gr. T. i. p. 297. ^f Prædest. i. n. 47.

^g Vid. Epiph. T. i. p. 605, T. ii. p. 147. ^h Hier. 67, n. 1. ⁱ Ap. Athan.

T. 2. p. 235, D. Ed. Bened. ^k — *πνευματικῶν δε των ανθρωπων φασκει.* x. l. Epiph. H. 67, n. 1.

(E) Beausobre is peased to say, (T. i. p. 431) 'What we know of his sentiments is, that he denied the resurrection of the body; that he did not believe, that Jesus had a true human body; and that he admitted three principles of all things, God, Matter, and Malice.' But these things are not in Epiphanius. Beausobre here builds upon a passage of a writer of the seventh or eighth century: De Hieracites locus insignis Joannis Carpathi episcopi, ex MS. opere de Anachoretis, productus a Cangio in Appendice ad Glossarium Græcum: — *οτινες λε-*

γουσι, μη ανθρωπινον σωμα ανεληφεναι τον σωτηρα, μητε ευρεισθαι το ημιτερον σωμα περιλαμβανειν και οτι τρεις εισιν αρχαι, θεος και υλη και κακια. ap. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. 8, p. 333. I need to say no more, than that this is not an authentic account of the principles of Hierax the Egyptian, mentioned by Epiphanius, and other ancient writers. If there ever were people called Hieracites, who held these notions, there is no reason to think they borrowed them from him.

^l Hier. 69, n. 7, p. 732, D. ^m Ath. de Synod. T. i. p. 729, E.

ⁿ — *nec sicut Manichæus partem unius substantiæ Patris natum exposuit; nec sicut Sabellius, — nec sicut Hieracas, lucernam de lucerna, vel lampadem in duas partes.* Hilar. de Trin. l. 4, p. 833. Vid. et l. 6, p. 881, et p. 885, D. E.

^o *αυτοι πολλοι των ασκητων των ανητων αυτου συναπηχθησαν.* Hier. 67, c. 1. p. 710, A.

Finally,

fight to the last, using no amanuensis, but writing out his own works, and transcribing likewise the works of others in a fair hand.

Such a character of this Egyptian Christian may well induce us to form a wish for some of his works; though, as may be collected from Epiphanius, his ^c interpretations of scripture were somewhat allegorical.

As all ancient writers in general, who make mention of Hierax, say he received the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, it may be concluded that his canon was much the same with that of other Christians in the place where he lived: in particular, we plainly perceive from Epiphanius that ^d he received the epistle to the Hebrews as the apostle Paul's: and, if Epiphanius be not mistaken, he ^e likewise made use of a book entitled *The Anabaticon*, or *Ascension of Isaias*.

8. Sebastian, a Manichee, then a young man, was general in Egypt in the reign of Constantius, about the year 356, and afterwards was in high offices under several emperors. Athanasius ^f complains of him more than once: he is mentioned several times by ^g Zosimus, and ^h Ammianus Marcellinus. A note ⁱ of Valefius upon the last mentioned writer contains a brief history and character of Sebastian, and shews particularly his acquaintance with Libanius.

9. Secundinus, an ^k auditor among the Manichees, wrote a letter to Augustine, which we still have in that ancient writer's works, together with his own answer.

Cave placeth Secundinus at the year 390: he ^l conjectures that he was of Africa, and speaks of his being an old friend and

^c Καὶ συντάξας τῆς ἑξαμήνης μῆθους τινὰς πλασάμενος, καὶ κομπῶδεις ἀλληγορίας. ib. B. ^d Vid. Epiph. ib. n. 2, 3, 6, 7.

^e Ib. n. 3, p. 712, A. ^f —παροξύνει τὸν φρατῆράτην Σεβαστιανόν, μανιχαίων οὐτα, κ. λ. Ath. Ap. pro fuga sua. n. 6, p. 323, C. Ἐχόντας δὲ ὑπεργῆς εἰς τὴν πομπήν τὸν δεκά Σεβαστιανόν, μανιχαίων οὐτα, καὶ ἀσελγῆ νεώτερον. Id. in Hist. Arian. ad Monach. p. 379, f. Vid. eund. ib. p. 381, C. 387, A. B. C. ^g Zosim. Hist. l. 3, p. 714, l. 4, 749. ^h —triginta millia—commisit Procopio, juncto ad parilem potestatem Sabastiano comite ex

duce Ægypti. Amm. Marcell. l. 23, c. 3, p. 385. Vid. eund. l. 31, c. 13, f. et passim. ⁱ Is est igitur Sebastianus dux Ægypti, secta Manichæus.—Erat autem filius Antiphili, a quo in disciplinam traditus Libanio, mox relicto eloquentiæ studio ad militiam se contulit, tametsi ex-

cellenti ingenio præditus: ut docet Libanius in epistolis duabus ad Antiphilum, quibus et aliam subjungit ad Sabastianum, exhortans ut redeat. Exstant in editione Cracoviensi Lat. Libanius 308, 340, 494, epistolas ad eum scribit. Valef. not. ^b. p. 385. ^k Secundinus quidam, non ex eis quos Manichæi electos, sed ex eis quos auditores vocant, quem nec facie quidem noveram, scripsit ad me velut amicus, honorifice objurgans, quod oppugnarem literis illam hæresim, et admonens ne facerem. Aug. Retr. l. 2, c. x.

^l Secundinus natione, ni fallor, Afer, secta Manichæus, claruit circa ann. 390, certe post Augustini ad ecclesiam reditum.—Magna illi cum Augustino intercesserat familiaritas, dum uterque in hæresi Manichæica versaretur.—Objicit Punicæ gentis perfidiam. Cav. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 286.

intimate acquaintance of Augustine. But herein that learned and laborious writer has made several mistakes; for Secundinus was a perfect stranger. Augustine^m had not any personal knowledge of him; nor was Secundinus an African, butⁿ a Roman, as he himself plainly intimates. If he had been an African he would not have reproached Augustine^o with the faithlessness of that country in deserting the Manichees. Tillemont^p mentions divers other reasons for thinking that Secundinus lived at Rome, or somewhere in Italy. Nor was this letter written so soon as the year 390; it is probable that Augustine would not long delay to answer it; but in his *Retractions* he speaks of his answer after his books against Faustus, and after the disputes held with Felix in the year 404, and after another book against the Manichees, entitled *De Natura Boni*. The character too which Augustine himself gives of his answer, as^q the best of all his books against the Manichees, leads us to suppose it was one of his last works written in that controversy. In a word, the order in which this book is placed, and the manner in which Augustine speaks of it, may induce us to think it was not written before 405 or 406.

V. The^r Manichæan sect, or church, as Augustine's phrase is, 'consisted of two parts, elect and auditors.' He afterwards says: 'As^s Mani had twelve disciples, in imitation of the twelve apostles, that number is still respected by the Manichees: for there are twelve of their elect, whom they call masters; and there is a thirteenth who is their president: they have seventy-two bishops ordained by the masters, and presbyters ordained by bishops. Their bishops likewise have deacons: the rest are called elect only: but when they are judged fit, they also are sent abroad, either for upholding and spreading their error where it is already, or for planting it where it is not.'

That we may the better judge of this division of the Mani-

^m Vid. not. k. ⁿ Legit enim aliquanta exile meum et quaecunque Romani hominis ingenium, reverendæ tuæ dignationis scripta, in quibus sic irasceris veritati, ut philosophiæ Hortensius. Secund. ad Aug. n. 3. ^o Muta quæso sententiam, deponere Punicæ gentis perfidiam, &c. ib. n. 2. ^p St. Augustin Art. 168, Mem. T. 13, p. 450, a Paris.

^q Huius autem mei voluminis titulus est, Contra Secundinum Manichæum: quod, mea sententia, omnibus quæ adverterius illam pestem scribere potui, facile præpono. Retr. l. 2, cap. x. ^r Nam in his duabus professionibus, hoc est, Electorum et Auditorum, ecclesiam suam con-

stare voluerunt. Aug. de Hær. cap. 46.

^s Propter quod etiam ipse Manichæus duodecim discipulos habuit, ad instar apostolici numeri, quem numerum Manichæi etiam hodie custodiunt. Nam ex electis suis habent duodecim, quos appellant magistros, et tertium-decimum principem eorum: episcopos autem septuaginta duos, qui ordinantur a magistris; et presbyteros, qui ordinantur ab episcopis. Habent etiam episcopi diaconos. Jam cæteri tantummodo Electi vocantur: sed mittuntur etiam ipsi qui videntur idonei ad hunc errorem vel ubi est sustentandum et augendum, vel ubi non est etiam seminandum. Id. ibid.

chees into elect and auditors, it is needful to take notice of some passages of divers authors.

Epiphanius calls their auditors ^t catechumens; and in The Acts of Archelaus the second order of the Manichees is ^u twice spoken of by the name of catechumens.

Fauftus expreffeth himself as if ^x by elect were meant clergy, and by auditors feculars, or the laity: Auguftine ^y in his argument takes notice of this without directly allowing it, that I perceive.

By the Manichæan rule a very different courfe of life was prefcribed to the elect from that of the auditors. Thefe laft ^z might eat flefh, drink wine, bathe, marry, traffick, poffefs eftates, bear magistracy, and the like; all which things were forbidden the elect, as appears from divers paffages of Auguftine. The elect ^a might eat grapes, but they were not to drink wine, though ever fo new: the elect alfo ate ^b apples, pears, melons, and all forts of fruit and herbage, and ^c common bread; but forbore, as it feems, not ^d only flefh, but alfo eggs, and milk, and ^e fifh. In this refpect, as Auguftine fays, the ^f elect and auditors looked like men of two different religions. He elfewhere fpeaks of the elect as ^g per-

sons

^t Παρακληνόνται ἢ τοῖς αὐτῶν κατηχη-
μοῖς τρεφὲν αὐτὸς δαψίλως· οἱ δὲ πάν-
στιν ἀναγκαῖον προσφέρει τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς
αὐτῶν. Epiph. H. 66, c. 53, p. 665, B.

^u — μετονομαζήνται ἐκ κατηχημάτων τῶ-
ν ματῶν. Arch. c. 9, p. 16, m. λέγεται κατηχη-
μεν. ib. p. 17. ^x Idcircoque Christo jam
credere non poterant, [Judæi], indifferen-
tiam docenti ciborum, et a suis quidem
discipulis omnia penitus removens, ſecul-
laribus vero vulgo concedenti omnia quæ
poſſent edi. Fauſt. l. 16, c. 6. Neque enim
juſta hæc nunc veſtra ſententia eſt, ut nos
quidem, qui ſolum in plebe ſacerdotale
hominum genus cenſeamus a carnibus
abſtinere debere, demoniorum doctrinæ
videamur vobis aſſectatores. Id. l. 30, cap.
1.

^y Auditoribus autem veſtris, quos
tamquam diſtinctos a genere ſacerdotum
dixiſti, ſecundum veniam hæc edenda
conceditis. Contr. Fauſt. l. 30, c. 5.

^z Auditores autem qui appellantur
apud eos, et carnibus veſcuntur, et agros
colunt, et ſi voluerint, uxores habent,
quorum nihil faciunt qui vocantur Electi.
Aug. ad Deuter. Ep. 236, al. 74. Niſi
forte quod non veſcimini carnibus, et vi-
num non bibitis. De Mor. Manich. c. 13,
n. 27. Quandoquidem auditores veſtri,
quorum apud vos ſecundus gradus eſt,
ducere atque habere uxores non prohi-
beantur. ib. c. 18, n. 65.

^a Nam et

vinum non bibunt, dicentes fel eſſe tene-
brarum, cum veſcantur uvis: nec muſti
aliquid, vel recentiſſimi, ſorbent. De Har.
c. 46. jam vero quæ tanta perverſio eſt,
vinum putare fel principum tenebrarum, et
uvis comedendis non parcere? De Mor.
Manich. c. xvi. n. 44.

^b Vid. de M.
Manich. cap. xiii. et xiv. ^c Sicut enim
in ipſo errore veſtro, cum eo pane veſci-
mini quo caeteri homines, et fructibus vi-
vatis et fontibus, lana et lino ſimiliter tex-
to amiciamini, &c. Contr. Fauſt. l. 20, c.
23. ^d Nec veſcuntur ſaltem carnibus.
—Nec ova ſaltem ſumunt,—ſed nec
alimonia lactis utuntur.—De Har. cap.
46. ^e —cur ita eum vos noxiū
prædicatis, ut ſi alia eſca non occurrat,
prius fame conſumamini, quam piſce veſ-
camini. Contr. Fauſt. l. 16, c. 9.

^f —non intuentes, non conſiderantes,
in eiſdem habendis agendiſque rebus tan-
tum ad diverſam vitam valere, ſi diverſa
ſit fides, ut cum auditores veſtri et uxores
habeant, et filios quamvis inviti ſuſcipi-
ant, eiſque patrimonia congerant vel cuſ-
todiant, carne veſcantur, vinum bibant,
lavent, metant, vindemiant, negotientur,
honores publicos adminiſtrent, vobiſcum
eos tamen, non cum gentibus computetis,
cum facta eorum gentibus videantur ſimi-
liora quam vobis. Contr. Fauſt. l. 20, c.
23. ^g —quam purgare putant Elec-
tis

ſons v
in the
ſom
unle
of th

For
wine,
proph
them
and l

pure
was f

they,
of thi

Mani
the c

to hu
was th

affirm

Th
kneel

tis ſui
electi

46. No
neation
juſtitia

Enar. i
de quo
malum

hæreſis
diebam

ſ. n. 11
iſſemur

runtan
futuru

nichæu
Spiritu

viſim
ide,
cibus,

Felic. l
creatur

dicitis,
ſeculer

mo, hæ
ho'uſin

catione
Contr.
dem, q
iſſimen

p. 90.

sons who pretended to greater perfection, and were supposed to be in the highest rank for virtue, and more holy than others: and he sometimes pleasantly calls the elect^h their grandees or quality; unless he is to be understood to mean only some of the chief even of them.

For what reasons the elect were required to forbear flesh and wine, is not clear. The catholic Christians often say that * Paul prophesied of them in 1 Tim. iv. 1—4. And Augustine charges them with † thinking such meats to be evil in their own nature; and Faustus himself says that, † in his opinion, all flesh is impure; possibly, however, for no other reason, but because flesh was supposed to be a great fuel of concupiscence, which therefore they, who were obliged to continence, ought to avoid: somewhat of this kind is intimated in The Acts of †† Archelaus. If so, the Manichæan elect forbore those things for the like reasons that the catholics, as Augustine says, practised || certain abstinences, to humble the body and strengthen the mind ||*. But that this was the only reason and foundation of this forbearance, I do not affirm.

The auditorsⁱ were obliged to maintain the elect. They^k kneeled down to the elect to ask their blessing. This ceremony was

tis suis eo genere vitæ, quam vivunt Electi Manichæorum, velut sanctius et excellentius Auditoribus suis. De Hær. cap. 46. Nottis, fratres, — quasi iustos eminentiores, in se tenentes primum gradum iustitiæ, Electos vocari apud Manichæos. Hær. in Pf. 140. n. 10. ^h Nam etiam de quodam dicente, nullam substantiam malum esse, unus de primatibus hujus hæresis, quem familiarius crebriusque audiebamus, dicebat. De M. Manich. cap. 8. n. 11. — cum ad ipsos primates detullemus, — ib. c. 19, n. 70. * Verumtamen quod apostolus Paulus — futurum præviderit in talibus, qualis Manichæus fuit, quales et estis vos. — Spiritus autem manifeste dicit, quia in novissimis temporibus quidam recedent a fide, — prohibentes nubere, abstinere a cibis, quos Deus creavit, &c. Act. cum Felic. l. i. c. 7. † Vos autem ipsam creaturam negatis bonam, et immundam dicitis, quod carnes diabolus operetur faculentiore materia mali. — Hoc animo, hac voluntate, hac opinione ab escis huiusmodi temperatis, quod non significatione, sed natura malæ et immundæ sint. Contr. Faust. l. 30. c. 5. † Ego quidem, quia omnem carnem immundam existimem. Faust. l. 6, c. i. †† Cum

quis vestrum carnalibus, aliisque cibis fuerit satiatus, tunc ei concupiscentiæ oboritur invitatio. — Manes ap Arch. cap. 14, p. 17. || Et Christiani, non hæretici, sed catholici, edomandi corporis causa, propter animam in orationibus amplius humiliandum, non quod illa immunda esse credant, non solum a carnibus, verum etiam a quibusdam terræ fructibus abstinent. Contr. F. l. 30, c. 5.

||* See Beauf. T. 2, p. 767, &c.

ⁱ Suisque Auditoribus ideo hæc arbitrantur ignosci, quia præbent inde alimenta Electis suis. — Itaque ipsi Electi, nihil in agris operantes, nec poma carpentes, nec saltem folia ulla vellentes, expectant hæc afferri usibus suis ab Auditoribus suis. — Aug. de Hær. cap. 46. Illac autem purgare nos ab istis sordibus expetentes, cum eis qui appellarentur electi et sancti, asserremus escas. — Confess. l. 4, c. i. in. Vid. et Epiph. H. 66, c. 53, p. 665, B. supra citat. not. t p. 88. ^k Sed ipsi Auditores ante Electos genua figunt, ut eis manus supplicibus imponantur: non a solis presbyteris vel episcopis aut diaconibus eorum, sed a quibuslibet electis. Aug. ad Deut. Ep. 236, al. 74, n. 2.

Dd 3

performed

performed by the auditors before all the elect, and not only before bishops, presbyters and deacons.

From all these passages we may be able to form some judgment concerning this distinction in the Manichæan sect. Archelaus and Epiphanius denoting the second order by the name of catechumens, we might have been induced to think that elect and auditors, among the Manichees, answered to faithful and catechumens among the catholics. But when we consider what Faustus said, and that the elect, when qualified, were employed in spreading their principles, and that the auditors maintained the elect, and asked a blessing from them upon their knees, we are rather led to another notion.

Beaufobre gives this account of the matter: 'The^l elect were 'their doctors, their bishops, their presbyters, their ecclesiastical 'ministers: but this title does not properly denote the episcopate, 'or any other office; it denotes a particular kind of life, or the ob- 'servation of some counsels, called evangelic; such rules as Mani 'had prescribed to those who aimed at perfection, and particu- 'larly to the ministers of his sect. Thus the Manichæan elect 'were the ministers of their church, and in general all who 'made profession of celibacy, virginity, poverty, and practised 'certain abstinences and austerities, which were judged proper 'for them; for which reason they are called^m the perfect by 'Theodoret.' Beaufobre farther observes that, 'among the ca- 'tholics, catechumens were such as had not been initiated by bap- 'tism; whereas among the Manichæan auditors there were many who had been baptized, though perhaps not all.

According to this account, as the same learned writer expresseth himself in another^o place, 'the elect were ecclesiastics, and in 'general all such as made profession of observing certain coun- 'sels, called evangelic; as if we should say the clergy and the 'monks. The auditors were laity.'

Whether this account be quite right I cannot certainly say; for Augustine seems to intimate that^p the reason why he was not present at their eucharist was, that he was only an auditor.

But, however that be, I would observe that the word elect, denoting the higher order so often found in Augustine, is also used in the like manner^q by Gregory Nazianzen; and that^r some Ma-
nichees,

^l Hist. de Manich. T. 2, p. 763, 764. See likewise T. i. p. 17, n. 8.

^m οἱ καλεσμένοι τέλειτοι παρ' αὐτοῖς. H. Fab. l. 1, c. 26, p. 214, A. ⁿ Ib. p. 763.

^o Ib. T. i. p. 17, note 8. ^p Quid autem inter vos agatis, qui Electi estis, ego scire non possum. Nam et eucharis-

tiam audiui a vobis sæpe quod accipiat: tempus autem accipiendi cum me lateret, quid accipiat, unde nosse potui? Disput. contr. Fort. i. n. 2. ^q — ὡς περ οἱ

μανιχαῖοι τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς λειτουργοῖς, ὅταν τε-
ροστον αὐτοῖς ἐκκαλεσθῶσι. Greg. N. Or. 52, p. 746, C. ^r Nam Quidam vester audi-

p. 95.

nichees, who were only in the rank of auditors, appear to have practised much strictness and abstemiousness, resembling that required of their elect.

Beaufobre thinks that ^a the auditors were so called because they heard in the church whilst others taught and instructed.

I do not remember to have seen in him, or any one else, a reason assigned for the use of the word elect, denoting all those of the sect which were not auditors: but perhaps they borrowed it from those texts of the gospels and epistles where the word is used for Christians, or God's peculiar people; as Matt. xxiv. 22, 24, 31; Luke xviii. 7; Rom. viii. 33; Col. iii. 12; and other places: Augustine ^t has a passage which may lead us to this thought.

Photius, in his first book against the Paulicians, usually reckoned a branch of the Manichees, relates a singularity of theirs: they ^a reduced all their sect, or the professors of their principles, to six churches: the first was called Macedonia, the second Achaia, the third was called the church of the Philippians, the fourth that of the Laodiceans, the fifth that of the Ephesians, the sixth that of the Colossians; themselves ^x they called Christians; the catholics they named Romans, as ^y if they had been mere heathens. This fancy of reducing their sect to six churches is also taken notice of by ^z Peter of Sicily, and the author of The Form of abjuring Manichæism, as it is in ^a Cotelarius, and ^b Tollius.

Moreover, it was a common thing among them, their leaders especially, to change the name by which they were first called for that of some apostolical man. Photius ^c produces several instances: Simeon, who changed his name to Titus; Joseph, who, leaving his own name, took that of Epaphroditus; Gegnesius, who altered his name to Timothy; and Sergius, who called himself Tychicus: infomuch that Mr. Wolff, the learned editor of Photius, could not forbear remarking that ^d these people mightily affected apostolical things.

tor. in illa memorabili abstinentia nihilo electis cedens. De M. Manich. c. 20, n. 74, in. ^s T. 2, p. 763.

^t Electi quidem Dei sunt omnes sancti, et habemus hoc in scripturis? sed usurparunt sibi illud nomen, et quasi familiarius sibi applicaverunt, ut tanquam proprie jam Electi appellentur. Enarr. in Pf. 140, n. 10.

^u Εξ δὲ αὐτῶν ἀνομολογῶσιν ἐκκλησίαις, ὡς τὴν μὲν μακεδονίαν καλεῖσιν. κ. λ. Phot. l. i. cap. v. in. ^x Καὶ τὴς μὲν ἀλλήως οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς ῥωμαῖοι οἱ τρισταλῆται οὐκ ὀνομάζουσιν· αὐτοὶ δὲ τὴν κλῆσιν, ἧς ἀλλοῖσι παύλως καθεστήκασι, τῶν χριστιανῶν ἀντιπαύλως. Phot. ib. l. i. cap. 6.

^y Seipso — Christianos nuncupant; nos autem — Romanos, Ethnico nomine proprium permutare conati, appellant. Pet. Sic. ap. Bib. Patr. T. 16, p. 756, B.

^z Vid. supr. not. ^y. ^a Ap. Recognit. Clem. l. 4, c. 27. ^b Insign. Ital. p. 144.

^c Phot. ib. l. i. c. iv. ^d Adeo in omnibus apostolici ævi speciem affectarunt, ut, quemadmodum virorum apostolicorum, ita et ecclesiarum veteris memoria nomine adoptarent, ad exemplum factionis istius, quæ apostolicorum nomine apud veteres nominatur. Ap. Phot. p. 15.

VI. The Manichees are sometimes spoken of as an impious, dissolute sort of people: their eucharist particularly is represented as an abominable rite, not fit to be described; as may be seen in ^e Cyril of Jerusalem, and ^f Augustine. Beausobre ^g speaks largely to this infamous story of their eucharist, to whom I refer: however I shall here mention some of his arguments and observations.

The thing is altogether incredible, especially when related ^h of people who by profession were Christians; who believed that Jesus Christ was a perfect model of all virtues; who acknowledged the reasonableness and excellence of the precepts of the gospel, and that the essence of religion lies in obeying them.

The Manichees always denied their practising the abominable rites laid to their charge: so ⁱ Augustine himself says. And in the year 392, when he had been several years a catholic, and was now presbyter, he had a public conference with Fortunatus, a Manichæan presbyter. Before they enter into dispute upon matters of belief, Fortunatus openly calls upon Augustine, who for several years was one of them, to tell ^k if he knew any of the crimes with which they were reproached. This confidence of Fortunatus, says ^l Beausobre, is a strong presumption of the innocence of the sect. Augustine ^m puts by that question. When he is still pressed by Fortunatus, who insists upon an answer, Augustine is not able to produce any thing material against them of his own knowledge; but excuseth ⁿ himself because he was not one of the elect, but only an auditor.

In the year 391 or 392, Augustine wrote a book for the sake of his friend Honoratus, whom ^o of a heathen he had persuaded to become a Manichee; who also still adhered to that sect when

^e Cat. vi. cap. 33. ^f Qua occasione, vel potius execrabilis superstitionis quadam necessitate, coguntur Electi eorum velut eucharistiam conspersam cum semine humano sumere.—Sed hoc se facere negant, et alios nescio quos sub nomine Manichæorum id facere affirmant. Detecti tamen sunt in ecclesia, sicut scis, apud Carthaginem,—ubi puella nomine Margarita istam nefariam turpitudinem prodidit, quæ cum esset annorum nondum duodecim, propter hoc scelestum mysterium se dicebat esse vitiatam. Tunc Eusebiam quamdam Manichæam quasi sanctimonialem, idipsum propter hoc ipsum passam, vix compulsi confiteri,—quæ totum illud turpissimum scelus, ubi ad excipiendum et commiscendum concumbentium semen farina substernitur,—similiter indicavit. Aug. de Hæres. cap. 46.

^g Beauf. Hist. de Manich. l. 9, ch. 7, 8, 9. T. 2. p. 720, &c. ^h Beauf. ib. p. 732.

ⁱ Sed hoc se facere negant. Vid. supr. not. f.

^k Ex te ergo præsentem audiant boni viri, utrum sint vera super quibus criminamur et appetimur, an sint falsa.—Purgare me prius volo penes conscientiam vestram—si ea quæ tacitantur vidit in nobis, vel consecutus est. Act. contr. Fortunat. in.

^l Ibid. p. 737, m. ^m Interfui. Sed alia quæstio est de fide, alia de moribus: ego de fide proposui. Act. Fortun. n. 2.

ⁿ Nostis autem me non Electum vestrum, sed Auditorem fuisse.—Quid autem inter vos agatis, qui electi estis, ego scire non possum, et reliqua. ib. n. 3.

^o Tu nondum Christianus, qui hortatu meo, cum eos vehementer execraris, &c. De Util. Cred. c. i. n. 2.

p. 100.

he himself had left it. Augustine is allowed to argue here for the most part very well: but, says ^p Beaufobre, why does he not in this book, for the sake of his dear and illustrious friend, make use of that decisive argument, their abominable mysteries? No good reason, he thinks, can be assigned for this omission; but that there was no ground for the accusation.

The general silence of ancient authors is another argument of the falsehood of this story. Cyril of Jerusalem published his Catechetical Discourses about the year 347, seventy years, as is supposed, after the death of Mani: but, as ^q Beaufobre says, he is the first who has spoken of this matter: and ^r from Cyril to Augustine he does not find any author, Christian or heathen, who has reproached the Manichees with these obscene mysteries. There ^s is no mention made of them in The Dispute of Archelaus; Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, contemporary with Cyril, says not a word of them; nor has he perceived this accusation in any works of Ephrem; Theodoret, Titus of Bostra, and Abulpharagius, in his Dynasties, are also silent upon this head. And, as Beaufobre goes on, if to these fathers we add the two pagan philosophers, Alexander of Dicapolis, and Simplicius, who both wrote against these people, and are profoundly silent about the crimes they are reproached with, the number of witnesses to their innocence in this respect will greatly surpass that of their accusers.

I shall say nothing more concerning that point: but as ^t Suidas, without any particular regard to their eucharist, upbraids the Manichees with nocturnal assemblies and obscene mixtures, and others (F) often speak of them as an impious set of men, I shall add some things which perhaps may be of use to set the character of this people in a proper light.

About the year 388, some time after he was returned to the catholics, Augustine wrote two books; one entitled Of the Manners of the Catholic Church, the other Of the Manners of the Manichees; and they were occasioned by the Manichees ^u boasting of their own strict course of life, and ^x by their censures of the loose behaviour of the catholics.

At

^p Ib. p. 741. ^q ——— p. 725.^r ——— p. 728. ^s Ib. p. 734, 735.^t Καὶ καταδύσει τις τὰς ἐραγίας καὶ ὑπερ-
λαίας, καὶ παρανομίας μίξεις. κ. λ. Suid. V.
Manes.

(F) In Moreri's article of Manes are these words: 'He condemned marriage, still allowing his followers to plunge themselves in all manner of sensuality: ———' et condamnoit le mariage, permettant pourtant à ses disciples de se plonger dans toutes sortes de volup-

tez brutales. Docens, . . . illicitas esse nuptias, licitos concubitus promiscuos. Lamp. Synops. H. E. l. 2. c. 2. p. 125. How could any man believe that!

^u Jam baptizatus autem cum Romæ essem, nec ferre tacitus possem Manichæorum jactantiam de falsa et fallaci continentia et abstinentia, ——— scripsi duos libros, unum de Moribus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, alterum de Moribus Manichæorum. Retr. l. i. c. 7. ^x Nolite consec-

tari

At the beginning of the first of those two books Augustine owns that ^y the Manichees ensnared many by the specious appearance of chastity and temperance. This was the very thing that ^z brought his friend Alypius into their nets.

Augustine himself seems to have acquitted them. Whilst he was among them he lived a sensual course of life, and his head was filled with ambitious schemes: but he owns that ^a this was not owing to their doctrine; for they earnestly exhorted men, he says, to mind better things. So he writes at the beginning of his book addressed to his friend Honoratus: and at the end of it he speaks of the pale countenances of these ^b men.

It is a saying of Ephrem the Syrian, that ^c the devil gave Mani a pale complexion, the better to deceive the simple and unwary.

St. Chrysostom observes of the Manichees, that ^d they had an appearance of modesty, but they hid the wolf under sheep's clothing.

It appears, from divers things said by St. Jerom, that the ^e Manichees were great fasters, and that they had among them many virgins, persons who professed to live a chaste and single life. The gay ladies of his time endeavoured many ways to put a good face upon their luxurious course of life: sometimes they ^f said: *To the pure all things are pure.* And if at any time they met a woman who looked pale and sad, they would say: 'Ah child, thou art a nun, or a miserable Manichee, I suppose.'

Jerom, commenting upon Amos iii. 15, *And I will smite the winter-house with the summer-house,* says, that ^g by the ^h winter-house

^tari turbas imperitorum, qui vel in ipsa vera religione superstitiosi sunt, vel ita libidinibus dediti, ut obliti sint quid promiserint Deo. De Mor. Ec. Cath. c. 34, n. 75.

^y Sed quoniam duæ maxime sunt illecebræ Manichæorum, quibus decipiuntur incauti, — altera, cum vitæ castæ et memorabilis continentiae imaginem præferunt. De Mor. Ec. Ca. cap. i, n. 2.

^z — amans in Manichæis ostentationem continentiae, quam veram et germanam putabat. Confess. l. 6, c. 7, n. 12.

^a — cum vitæ huius mundi eram implicatus, tenebrosam spem gerens, de pulcritudine uxoris, de pompa divitiarum, de inanitate honorum, cæterisque noxiis et perniciosis voluptatibus. Hæc enim omnia, quod te non latet, cum studiose illos audirem, cupere et sperare non desistebam. Neque hoc eorum doctrinæ tribuo. Fateor enim et illos sedulo monere, ut ista caveantur. De Util. Cred. ad Honorat. c. i. n. 3.

^b — quo illi homines ex-

sanguines corporibus, sed crassis mentibus aspirare non possunt. ib. cap. ult.

^c Quare sic interpretor: Pallore Manetem diabolus tinxit, ut incautos falleret. Assem. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 119.

^d Καὶ γὰρ οἱ μανichaῖοι — τὸ σχῆμα μὲν ἐπιδεικνύνται ὑπερκαθάρσεως, καὶ κατακρυπτῶσι τὴν δόξαν τῆς προβαλῆναι τοῦ λυκοῦ. In Gen. Sermon. 7, p. 680, B. ed. Bened.

^e Atque utinam omni tempore jejunare possimus, — Nec tamen Manichææ hæreseos accusandi sunt, quum carnalis cibus præferri non debuerit spiritali. Ad Lucin. Ep. 52, al. 28, T. 4, p. 579.

^f Istæ sunt, quæ solent dicere: Omnia munda mundis. — Et quam viderint palentem atque tristem, Miseram, Monacham, et Manichæam vocant. De Custod. Virg. Ep. 18, al. 22, p. 32, f.

^g Et percutiet domum hyemalem; eos hæreticos, qui laborant continentia et jejuniis xerophagiis, chamæcuniis, e quibus

Tatianus

p. 105.

house may be understood those heretics that mortified themselves with fasting and abstinence, who fared hard and lodged hard, such as Tatian, and Mani, and their followers: the summer-house may denote the Nicolaitans and other heretics, who indulged their appetites, and lived in all manner of excess. And upon Joel i. 14, *Sanctify ye a fast*, he has these words: 'Mani and Tatian, and many other heretics, fast, but their fasting is worse than gluttony and drunkenness.' Once more the same ancient and learned writer declares: 'Virgins, suchⁱ as are said to be among divers heretics, and even among the impure Manichees, are to be esteemed whores, not virgins.' Such is the unhappiness of heresy which turns virtues into vices! It is true however, that the Manichees fasted and lived chastely; but their great abstinence and virginal chastity were of no value.

Chrysostom expresseth himself in the like manner. He says he dares not call the virgins of heretics virgins; and affirms that the sobriety of heretics is worse than the greatest dissoluteness.

I suppose the reason of these hard sentences may be, what is somewhere observed by Augustine, that^m actions are qualified by the views and ends with which they are performed.

I presume that all these passages of ancient writers may be sufficient to render it probable that the Manichees had no doctrines which countenanced a licentious course of life. Some of their elect, it is likely, failedⁿ in observing the strict rules by which they were bound; but so it was with the catholics: there were bad livers likewise among them; some^o who pretended to much sanctity and devotion were guilty of great enormities. Augustine's complaint of the Manichees is verified in all parties; men^p say, and do not; they commend and teach what they do not perform.

VII. The

Tatianus et Manichæus. Et domum æstivam, ut Nicolaitas, — qui propter ventris ingluviem, omnem recipiunt voluptatem. In Amos l. i. T. 3, p. 1396, in.

^k Jejunat Manichæus et multi hæretici, maximeque Encratitæ, quorum princeps Tatianus. Sed hoc jejunium saturitate et ebrietate deterius est. In Joel. cap. i. ib. p. 1345, f.

^l Cæterum virgines, quales apud diversas hæreses, et quales apud impurissimum Manichæum esse dicuntur, scorta sunt æstimandæ, non virgines. De Custod. Virg. Ep. 18, T. 4, p. 47.

^k Τας γαρ των αιρετικων ην αν ητοιμασεν πολε παρθενης ηνω. Chr. de Virgin. T. i. p. 268, B.

^l Και γαρ ασχηγιας απαστης η των αιρετικων σωφροσυνη χριτων εστιν. ib. p. 271. E. Vid. et. A. B. C. ib.

^m Nisi forte quod non vescimini carnis, et vinum non bibitis, — Quod quæro a vobis, quo fine faciatis? Finis enim

quo referuntur ea quæ facimus, — si non solum inculpabilis, sed etiam laudabilis fuerit, tunc demum etiam facta nostra laude aliqua digna sunt. De Mor. Manich. l. 2, cap. 13, n. 27. — Sed tamen significantes, vanam esse continentiam istam, nisi ad aliquem rectissimum finem, certa ratione feratur. ib. n. 28. Si ergo parcimonie gratia et coercendæ libidinis, qua escis talibus et potu delectamur et capimur, audio et probo. Sed non ita est. ibid. Vid. et eund. contr. Faust. l. v. c. 5.

ⁿ Vid. Aug. de Mor. Manich. cap. 18, 19, 20. ^o Novi multos esse sepulchrorum et picturarum adoratores. Novi multos esse, qui luxuriosissime super mortuos bibant, et epulas cadaveribus exhibentes, super sepultos se ipsos sepeliant, et voracitates, ebrietatesque suas deputent religioni, &c. De Mor. Ec. Ca. c. 34, n. 74.

^p Cum autem laudatis et docetis ista, nec

VII. The Manichees seldom had the protection of the Roman laws. Tillemont, in his history of this people, has an entire article concerning the laws of the emperors against them. In Augustine's works against the Manichees we find frequent notice of the difficulties they lay under. Faustus ^a glories in the persecutions they endured, as a proof of their being good Christians: this was a common subject of boasting among them: and they argued that ^r they were not of the world, and must needs be sincere lovers of truth, because the world hated them, and they were always under persecution.

It appears by Augustine's second day's conference with Felix, at Hippo, in the year 404, that the Manichæan books, or papers of Felix, had been taken from him, and were in the custody of a public officer. Felix ^s desired to have them restored to him for his assistance in the debate: Augustine at length allows that any thing he pointed to might be recited out of those writings. Among them was a letter of Mani, called The Epistle of the Foundation. And, in the first day's conference, Felix several times intimates ^t the difficulty he lay under in disputing against the imperial laws.

When Augustine ^u speaks of the banishment of Faustus and others into an island, I think he intimates that by law they might have been punished more severely: for he says that moderate sentence was obtained by the intercession of those very Christians who prosecuted Faustus and his Manichæan friends in the proconsul's court. And, in the same context, a little before, he speaks of the ^x advantage the Manichees had from the mildness of

nec facitis, quid vobis fallacius—dici aut inveniri potest? De Mor. Manich. c. 19, n. 68. ^a Vides pauperem.—esurientem, sitientem, persecutiones et odia sustinentem propter iustitiam. Et dubitas, utrum accipiam evangelium? Faust. l. 5, c. 1. ^r Ubi est ergo quod perpetuum

sibi persecutionem in hoc mundo futuram prædicant, eoque se commendatores haberi volunt, hinc interpretantes, quod hic mundus eos oderit. De M. Manich. c. 19, n. 69.—aut definite vos inde iactare, quod multis detestabiles sitis. Contr. Faust. l. 6, c. 8. ^s Et quia nullam

scripturam inter manus habui, quia non mihi sunt redditæ, unde me instruere possem. Nullus enim ad certamen exit, nisi prius munitus fuerit: et nullus litigator potest sine suis chartis litigare. Similiter et ego sine mea scriptura respondere non possum.—Modo peto, codices reddentur mihi.—Aug. dixit: Sed quia codices tuos repetis, qui sub sigillo publi-

co custodiuntur.—Tolle autem codices tuos, et dic quid inde velis proferri.—Felix dixit: Omnes scripturas, quæ mihi sublatae sunt. Ista enim Epistola Fundamenti est, &c. Act. cum Fel. l. 2. c.

^t Non tantum ego possum contra tuam virtutem, deinde contra leges Imperatorum.—Act. cum. Fel. l. 1. c. 12. Vid. ib. infra, et cap. 6. ^u Faustus au-

tem convictus vel confessus, quod Manichæus esset, cum aliis nonnullis secum ad iudicium proconsulare perductis, eis ipsis Christianis a quibus perducti sunt intercedentibus, levissima poena, si tamen illa poena dicenda est, in insulam relegatus est: quod sua sponte quotidie servi Dei faciunt, se a turbulento strepitu populorum remove cupientes;—Denique non multo post inde omnes eadem sollemni sorte dimissi sunt. Contr. Faust. l. 6, c. 8. ^x Pro qua impia perversitate, propter Christianorum temporum mansuetudinem,

p. 109.

of the catholics, which was such that their sufferings were few, and almost none at all. But then it should be observed that ^y Augustine computes banishment into a desert island to be a mere trifle, and little more than retirement, which gives men an opportunity for meditation: moreover, as he assures us, the banishment of the Manichees beforementioned was of short duration; they were all soon released by public authority.

And it may be collected from some things said by Augustine, upon another occasion, that ^z though their assemblies were prohibited by law at Carthage, they ^a found opportunities to meet together for divine worship: such was the zeal of these unhappy people, or such was the moderation of those who were intrusted with the execution of the laws against them.

Not long after the year 440, pope Leo ^b made strict inquiry after the Manichees at Rome and in other places, and destroyed great numbers of their books; so writes Prosper: and from Leo himself, in a letter to the bishops of Italy, we learn that ^c he detected many of this people at Rome: some he converted; the rest, who were unmoved by his arguments, were condemned to perpetual banishment as the laws directed.

Photius says that ^d, though many emperors had punished those apostates even with death, the progress of their impiety had not been stopped.

They who are desirous of knowing more of this matter may consult the Codes ^e of Justinian, and ^f Theodosius; where are divers laws against these men, which cannot be denied to have an appearance of much severity.

In Baronius ^g may be seen such a rescript of Dioclesian and Maximian, said to be given at Alexandria in the year 290, occasioned by an account received from Julian, proconsul of Africa,

etudinem, quam parva et prope nulla patiamini, cur non cogitatis? ib.

^y Vid. not. ^u. ^z ——— quod eo tempore, quo conventicula eorum lege publica prohiberentur. De Mor. Man. c. 19, n. 69. ^a Non erant hi [Electi] ex una domo, sed diverse prorsus habitantes, ex eo loco ubi conventus omnium factus erat, pariter forte descenderant. ib. n. 68.

^b Hoc tempore plurimos Manichæos intra Urbem latere diligentia Papæ Leonis innotuit, qui eos de secretis suis erutos, et oculis totius ecclesiæ publicatos, omnes dogmatis sui turpitudines et damnare fecit et prodere, incensis eorum codicibus, quorum magnæ moles erant interceptæ, &c. Prosper. Chr. Integr. ap. Canis. et Basnag. Læction. T. i. p. 304.

^c Plurimos impietatis Manichææ sequa-

ces et doctores in Urbe investigatio nostra reperit. ——— Aliquantum vero, qui ita se demerferant, ut nullum his auxiliantis posset remedium subvenire, subditi legibus, secundum Christianorum principum constituta, ne sanctum gregem sua contagione polluerent, per publicos judices perpetuo sunt exilio relegati. Leo. Ep. 2. ad omn. Ep. Ital. ^d ——— πολλὰν δὲ εὐσεβῶν βασιλέων ἔϊψεν τὴν δικὴν τῆς ἀποστασίας ἐκπράττοντων, καὶ μὴδ' ἡτῶς τῆς αἰσχρῆς φώρας ἰσαμίνης. Phot. Contr. Man. l. i. c. 16, p. 61. ^e Just. cod. l. i. Tit. v. De Hæreticis, et Manichæis, et Samaritis.

^f Cod. Theod. l. 16. Tit. v. De Hæreticis. ^g Baron. Ann. 287, n. i. ii. &c. Vid. et Coteler. Mon. Gr. T. i. p. 773, 779.

of

of the great disturbances occasioned by the Manichees in that country. This rescript is, I think, generally allowed to be ^h genuine: but Samuel Basnage ⁱ offers divers weighty arguments against that supposition: one of them is, that there is no mention of this law in Eusebius, Cyril, or Augustine: he has many other reasons which are very considerable, and may be seen in his own work.

Indeed it seems to me altogether unlikely that Manichæism should so soon have gained footing, and made such progress in Africa, as is here supposed, so as to cause disturbances to divers people and ^k cities, and ^l be received by men of high rank as well as others.

It appears to me also very probable that, if Dioclesian had made such a law as this, the Manichees would have been expressly named in Constantine's edicts against heretics; whereas, it does not appear from Eusebius that ^m they were so named in any such laws of that Christian emperor.

It must be owned Ammianus Marcellinus says that 'Constantine', desirous to get exact information concerning the opinions of divers sects, the Manichees and the like, employed Strategius for that purpose; who acquitted himself so well in the office assigned him, that the emperor ordered he should for the future be called Musonianus.' But perhaps Ammianus accommodates his way of speaking to the state of things in his own time, when the Manichees were well known as well as greatly disliked. Ammianus mentions no other sect distinctly beside the Manichees, as if they were the principal subject of inquiry; which can hardly be allowed when we perceive from our ecclesiastical historians that there were other sects at that time which made much more noise in the Roman empire: however, the inquiry here spoken of is no proof that the Manichees were named in any of Constantine's laws against heretics.

Beaufobre ^o admits the genuineness of this law: but then he says Dioclesian ^p and his ministers must have been very little ac-

^h Vid. Tillem. Les Manicheens Art. 17. et Diocletien. § 14. ⁱ Basn. Ann. 287, n. iv. ^k ——— et multa facinora ibi committere: populos namque quietos perturbare, nec non civitatibus maxima detrimenta inferre. ap. Baron. ib. n. 3. ^l Si qui sane etiam honorati, aut cujuscunque dignitatis, vel majoris personæ, ad hanc inauditam, turpemque sectam, ——— se transfulerunt. ib. n. 4. ^m Vid. Euf. de Vit. Constant. l. 3, cap. 63, 64.

ⁿ Constantinus enim cum limatius superfectionum quæreret sectas, Manichæo-

rum et similibus, nec interpres inveniretur idoneus, hunc sibi commendatum ut sufficientem elegit: quem officio functum perire, Musonianum voluit appellari, ante Strategium dictitatum. Amm. M. l. 15, c. 13. ^o See B. Hist. de Man. T. i. p. 183. T. 2, p. 799.

^p Diocletien et ses ministres connoissoient fort mal ces heretiques, s'ils les croyoient capables d'approuver les incestes, eux qui toleroient à peine le mariage. ib. T. i. p. 284.

p. 114.

quainted with the true principles of the Manichees; which I think should have led him to suspect the reputed original of this rescript, and ascribe it rather to some ignorant and designing impostor.

Before I conclude the remarks upon this rescript, I should acknowledge that it is mentioned in ^a the Commentaries upon St. Paul's thirteen epistles, usually joined with the works of St. Ambrose: but, as the Benedictine editors say, those ^r Commentaries have been interpolated in many places; and they may have been so here. However, the age of that work is not certainly known: I formerly ^s took some notice of it.

SECT. II. The History of MANI.

I. *His name, country, parents, qualifications.* II. *The time of the rise of Manichæism.*

I. MANI, always ^a so called by the Persians and Arabians, usually called Manes, or Manichee, by the Greeks and Romans, was ^b a Persian, or at least lived in the territories of the king of Persia; as is allowed ^c by all authors who speak of him.

Beaufobre ^d says it is certain he was a Persian, if thereby be meant that he was a native subject of the kings of Persia: but if thereby be meant that he was of the province of Fars, or Persia, it is doubtful. Ephrem says ^e he was a Babylonian; that is, of the province of Babylon, or else of Chaldæa, which ^f is often confounded with that of Babylon: this seems to be confirmed by The Acts of Archelaus, where ^g that bishop reproaches Mani

^a Quippe cum Diocletianus imperator constitutione sua designet, dicens: Sordidam hanc et impuram hæresim, quæ nuper, inquit, egressa est de Perside. Ambrosiast. in 2 Tim. c. iii. p. 310, C.

^b Illud insuper adjiciendum est, eosdem librios magna licentia saltem in tres priores epistolas abufos esse: quandoquidem ab eis non raro longa fragmenta ibidem inserta fuisse probabile est, quæ in vetustioribus manuscriptis non inveniuntur, &c. Admon. p. 21, f. ^c See before, p. 155.

^d Manes Persa, in eorum libris dictus Mani pictor, nam talis fuit professione sua. — Cum itaque in omnibus Arabum et Persarum libris constanter vocetur Mani, hoc verum ejus nomen Persicum fuisse tuto credamus. Hinc Græcis et aliis vulgo audit Manes. Hyde de Relig. Vet. Pers. c.

21, p. 280, 281. Vid. et Moshem. de Reb. Christian. ante Constantin. m. p. 734.

^b Μανης δε ετος απο της των περσων ερηματο γης. Epiph. Hær. 66, n. 1.

Manichæi a quodam Persa extiterunt, qui vocabatur Manes. Augustin. de Hær. c. 46, in.

Persa, quem accusasti, non adderit. Secundin. Ep. ad Aug. c. 3.

^c Manetem genere Persam omnes veteres faciunt. Assem. B. Or. T. i. p. 122.

^d T. i. p. 66. ^e Babylonium fuisse docet [Ephræm] infra hymno xiv. Assem.

ib. ^f Vid. Cellar. Orb. Ant. T. 2, p. 755. ^g Persa barbare, non Græcorum linguæ, — non ullius alterius linguæ scientiam habere potuisti, sed Chaldæorum solum, &c. Arch. n. 36, p. 63.

with

with understanding no language but his Chaldee; which implies that he was a Chaldean.

It is not a little disagreeable to observe the poor thoughts of divers ancient Greek writers, occasioned by the name of this man. The thing is taken notice of by several moderns: I quote two of them in the margin, ^h Cave and ⁱ Tollius.

They speak as if his name had been derived from the Greek noun mania, signifying madness, or from the verb mainomai; and as if his name were the same as maneis, that is, mad or furious; whereas the name is certainly Persic or Chaldaic. Eusebius, formerly quoted, is pleased to allude to this imaginary signification of the word. Cyril of Jerusalem says, 'he ^k changed his name from Cubricus to Manes, thinking thereby to gain honour among the Persians; but divine providence so ordered it that he thereby affixed to himself among the Greeks the character of madness.' Epiphanius ^l has somewhat to the like purpose. Titus of Bostra, who writes the name Maneis, instead of Manes, has also condescended ^m to adopt this slight thing; for so I must call it, though it is also found in so fine a writer as ⁿ Photius.

The poor people were so often teased with this silly fancy, that, as Augustine says, for that reason they ^o prolonged the name, and called their master Manichee, to avoid the reproach of that odious derivation: and some of them pretended that the true way of writing the name was Mannichee, denoting one that poured down the heavenly bread manna. I have transcribed at the bottom of the page two passages of Augustine, where he speaks

^h Græci vero, quo aptiorem irridendi occasionem arripere, illud a *μανια* deducere solent. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 140, f. Oxon.

ⁱ Quia vero, Græcis, aut Græca intelligentibus adversariis, vox illa *Μανης* uberiorem irridendi ansam præbebat, quasi a Græco *μανια*, infania, seu *μανομαι*, insanio, derivata esset, et sic nomen et omen infantiæ Maneti obtigisset; tum quod et eadem vox *Μανης* stupidum significaret, ut apud Aristophanem, *Μεγαλὸς θ' ὁ Μανης*. Manichæi Manichæos se vocari volebant, quasi derivato nomine a manahath requies. Nec apud Judæos iidem contumelia caruerunt, qui omnes impios Manetes appellarunt, &c. Toll. not. ap. insign. Ital. p. 126.

^k ἡ δὲ τὴν θεὰ οἰκονομίαν καὶ ἀκοῖαν αἰῶνος αἰὲν καλῶς ποιεῖν ἐποίησεν γενέσθαι· ἵνα ἐν περὶ τῆς νομισίας αἰῶνος τιμῇ, παρ' ἑλλήσι μανίας ἐπωνυμιον αἰῶνος καταγγέλλῃ. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 24.

^l Her. 66, n. 1, p. 617, C. D.

^m οὐδὲ μανίης ἐκ βαρβαρίων, καὶ τῆς μανίας

αἰῶνης ἐπωνυμιος. κ. λ. Titus contr. Manich. l. i. in. p. 60.

ⁿ Vid. Phot. contr. Man. l. i. c. 12, p. 45, 46, 47.

^o Manichæi a quodam Persa exstiterunt, qui vocabatur Manes: quamvis et ipsum, cum ejus insana doctrina cœpisset in Græcia prædicari, Manichæum discipuli ejus appellare maluerunt, devitantes nomen infantiæ. Unde quidam eorum quasi doctiores, et eo ipso mendaciores, geminata n littera, Mannichæum vocant, quasi manna fundentem. Aug. de Hær. c. 46, in.

Et per dominum vestrum Manichæum, qui manes lingua patria vocabatur. Sed vos, ut apud Græcos nomen infantiæ vitaretis, velut declinato et prolongato nomine, quasi fusionem addidistis, ubi amplius laberemini. Sic enim mihi quidam vestrum exposuit, cur appellatus sit Manichæus, ut scilicet in Græca lingua tamquam manna fundere videretur, quia Græce fundi *χεῖν* dicitur, &c. Contr. Faust. l. 19, c. 22.

of

p. 120.

of this matter. James Basnage, in his notes upon Titus^p, has judiciously censured both sides for these trifles. One might be apt to think that ^aMani, or Mane, or Manes, should be the name of the man, and ^rManichæus denote a follower of him. But the Greeks and Latins do often use ^sthis last for himself, as well as the former. I put in the margin ^ta few other observations, though of no great importance, concerning the different ways of writing this name in several authors. I hope I need not make any apology for generally writing his name Mani ^u after the people of the east, where he lived: and Epiphanius says that ^xMane was the name he took instead of Cubricus.

It is not among the Greeks that we must seek for the original of this name; for Archelaus himself says that ^yCorbicius changed his name after the death of the widow, his patroness, at the

^p—Ut averterent omen Manetis discipuli apud Græcos Manichæum illum appellabant, eumque velut angelum e cœlis *μαννα χεντα*, panem cœlestem, mannam scilicet, effundentem referebant. Sic ab utraque parte ludebatur circa nominis etymologiam. Sed fuites admodum sunt illæ observationes, quas quisque ad suæ partis gloriam trahere conatur. Basn. ad Tit. B. p. 60. ^qManichæi post hos de Perfide a Mane homine—ita dicto surrexerunt.—Philast. de H. c. 61, in.

^r—Notabis Manichæum dici a Leone, quem Manem potius vocare debebat. *Μανης* est hæresiarcha ipse, *Μανιχαῖος*, qui eius sectæ est, et *Μανιχαῖον δόγμα*. Tamen nunquam aliter a veteribus patribus vocatur, quam Manichæus, ut Hieronymo, et aliis primæ notæ scriptoribus: quod perinde est, ac si Marcionista pro Marcione diceretur, Valentinianus pro Valentino, Photinianus pro Photino. Neque Semel *Μανιχαῖος* et *Μανης* pro eodem apud Epiphanium. Jof. Scal. Animadv. in Euf. Chron. p. 240, f.

^s Even in the Acts of Archelaus Mani's name is written both ways, that is, sometimes he is called Manes, at other times Manichæus. I shall refer to some examples: et post triduo venit ad Manem. Arch. c. 6, p. 9. Nullum ex nobis, ^to Manes, Galatam facies. ib. c. 36, p. 62. His auditis, turbæ volebant comprehendere Manem, c. 55, p. 100. Dic mihi illud etiam, ^uo Manichæe. c. 49, p. 90. His letter to Marcellus is there thus inscribed: *Μανιχαῖος*, κ. λ. c. 5, p. 6. In like manner Epiphanius useth both ways of writing Mani's name.

^x Suidas says: *Μανης*, ὄνομα Περσῶν—*Μαννὸς* *Μαννῖδος*. Which might almost induce one to suppose, that he wrote the

name *Μαννῖς*, for *Μαννῆς* the proper name of a slave, is, I think, generally declined *Μαννῖ*. In Titus this name is always written *Μαννῖς*, and he declines as Suidas directs: *οἱ χαλκῆς πρὸς τὸ Μαννῖδος ἡπα- ἱμενον*. Tit. B. contr. Man. l. i. p. 64, m. The same way of declining is used in the Form of abjuring Manichæism. *Αναθε- ματίζω τὸν ληρώδη Μαννῖδος μύθον*. ap. Toll. p. 130. *Αναθεματίζω τὸν πατέρα Μαννῖδος Παλεκιον*. ib. p. 144. Epiphanius declines otherwise: *ἐκ Μαννῖτινος*. H. 66, n. i. p. 617, C. *ἐως τὴ Μαννῖ*. ib. c. 20, p. 637, D. *μαθητὴ οὗ τῆ Μαννῖ*. ib. c. 12, p. 629, B. I add some other examples from other authors.—*εἰς τὸν Μαννῖα*. Thdr. H. F. l. i. c. 26, p. 213, D. Cyril of Jerusalem always writes Manes, never Manichee. And he declines, as Epiphanius—*αὐτὸς τὴ κερὶν Μαννῖ εὐα- ἰστον ἐπωνομασεν*. Cat. 6, n. 24. *καὶ ἐπαλαίστω τὸν Μαννῖ οὐ Αρχειλαος*. ib. n. 30.—*ἀλλ' ἐνός τῶν κακῶν τριῶν τῆ Μαννῖ μαθητῶν*. ib. n. 31. How Philaster declined Manes, appears from the beginning of his article. See note ^q. In The Acts of Archelaus, where the name is written Manes, in the nominative, and not Manichæus, it is not prolonged in the genitive: et quomodo de Perfide venientem Manem.—Arch. n. 35, p. 61. His auditis, turbæ volebant Manem comprehensum tradere.—c. 55, p. 100.—non ex Mane originem mali hujus manasse. ib. p. 101. And see before note ^s.

^u Les Persans et les Arabes appellent notre herefuarque Mani.—Beauf. Hist. Manich. T. i. p. 73, m. and see note ^x. p. 116.

^x *Κυβρικὸς μὲν τὸ πρῶτον καλεῖται, ὁπονομασας δὲ εὐατὴ Μαννῖ ὄνομα*, H. 66, n. i. in.

court of Persia; and all the Greek writers in general say that in taking the name Manes he intended to secure himself honour among the Persians.

But though the name Mani be Persic or Chaldaic, learned moderns, skilled in the oriental languages, are not agreed about the original of it. However, it may be observed that Cyril of Jerusalem says, Manes ² in the Persian language signifies discourse or eloquence; and that he changed his name from Cubricus to Manes, partly to obliterate the memory of his servitude, partly for the sake of gaining the reputation of a good speaker: this is taken up by ^a Photius and others. Epiphanius says that ^b Mane, in the Babylonian language, signifies vessel or instrument: Ephrem the Syrian ^c seems to refer to this notion of the word; which is also approved by Asséman; and it may be supposed to be alluded to in ^d The Acts of Archelaus; nor does Hyde deny that ^e Mân, or Mana, in Assyrian and Chaldee, signifies vessel.

I shall not concern myself about other derivations or significations of this name; but only refer to some ^f authors, where they may be seen by those who are curious.

Whatever was the meaning of the name, as ^g Beaufobre observes, it certainly was very honourable; and, if it signified any thing, there is reason to think it denoted some advantageous quality; for ^h divers kings of Edeffa were named Manes or Maanes; and Asséman says that ⁱ it was a common name of the princes of Syria and Arabia.

It is said that Mani's father's name was Patitius or Patecius, and his mother's name Carossa: their names are in The ^k Form of

^v Tunc ergo Corbicius, sepulta Domina, bonis sibi derelictis omnibus uti coepit, et migravit ad medium civitatis locum, in quo manebat Rex Persarum, et commutato sibi nomine Manem semetipsum pro Corbicio appellavit. Arch. n. 53, p. 98.

² Εἶπε, ἵνα μὴ τὸ τῆς δουλείας ὄνομα ἐπονομασθῇ, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ καθ' ἑκαστὸν Μανὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπωνομασθῇ, ὅπερ κατὰ τὴν Περσῶν διαλεκτὴν τὴν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ γὰρ διαλεκτικὸς ἐδοκεῖ τις εἶναι, Μανὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπωνομασθῇ, οἷον οὐκ ἔστιν τῆς ἀρετῆς. κ. λ. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 24.

² Δηλοὶ δὲ τὸ τοῦ περὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν τὸν οὐκ ἔστιν οὐκ ἔστιν, καὶ πρὸς διαλέξιν δραστικόν. Ph. contr. Man. l. i. c. 12, p. 45.

^b Το γὰρ Μανὴ ἀπὸ τῆς βαβυλωνιακῆς εἰς τὴν ἑλληνικὰ μεταφερόμενον σκευὸς ἀποφαίνει τ' ἄνεμα. H. 66, n. i. p. 617. C. D.

^c Manes, Chaldaicum nomen, vas, vestem, instrumentum quodlibet significat. Huc spectat quod S. Ephraem hoc loco scribit: Manetem diabolus tamquam propria in-

duit veste, ut eo, velut instrumento suo abuteretur, suaeque per ipsum promeret oracula. Asséman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 119.

^d Vas es Antichristi, et neque bonum vas, sed sordidum et indignum. Arch. c. 36. p. 62. ^e Verum quidem est, quod in lingua Assyriaca et Chaldaica Mân seu Manâ sit Vas. De Rel. V. Pers. p. 281, in.

^f Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 281. 282. Hyde de Rel. Vet. Pers. p. 281. Le Moyné Var. Sacr. p. 634. Joseph. Scal. Animadv. in Euf. Chron. p. 240, 241. Touttée ad Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 24. Beaufobre. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 70—74. Jac. Basn. ad Tit. Bostr. l. i. p. 60.

^g T. i. p. 73. ^h Vid. Chron. Edeff. ap. Asséman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 418, 419, &c. ⁱ Maanus, nomen tum Syristum Arabibus principibus familiare. Asséman. ib. p. 418.

^k ἀναθεματίζω τὸν πατέρα μανιῶνος παλαιοῦ, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν μητέρα καλεῖται. ap. Toll. Insign. p. 144.

abjuring

abjuring Manichæism, and in ¹Hyde. Cave ^m has Patricius, by mistake probably; but the thing is of no importance.

The Greek writers continually represent Mani as a slave, purchased by a widow, and afterwards set at liberty. This we have already seen in Socrates, with whom others agree. This is one thing with ⁿ which Cyril upbraids him; though he at the same time owns that it is no real scandal. If he was once poor and a slave, he obtained his liberty, and came to the possession of a great estate by that time he was twelve years of age. According to ^o Archelaus, and ^p Cyril, the widow that purchased him for a slave soon set him at liberty, adopted him for her son, gave him a good education, and in the end made him her heir.

But I think it may be questioned whether Mani ever was a slave; for there is no notice taken of it in the eastern writers; and even the Greek authors speak of him as rich, learned, educated among philosophers, and at the court of Persia in his early age. Manes among the Greeks was a common name for ^q slaves: and one may be almost apt to think that this gave occasion for the common opinion of the Greek writers concerning Mani's servitude.

The eastern authors, cited by ^rHyde and ^sHerbelot, say that Mani was a painter and engraver by profession: what use he is said to have made of his skill in painting will be seen hereafter.

It is said by the same writers, quoted both by ^tHyde and ^uHerbelot, that he had so fine a hand as to draw lines and make circles without rule or compass: and he made a terrestrial globe with all it's circles and divisions.

¹ Ille——apud Shahristanum vocatur Manes ibn Phaten doctus seu Philosophus. At pro Phaten legendum Phatec. Nam pater fuit Πατακιος, et mater Καροσ-
ca. Hyde ib. p. 280. ^m——patre Patricio, matre Carossa natus. H. L. T. i. p. 140. b.

ⁿ——τα περι αυτη πολλοι κακα, μεμνηστο πρωτον την βλασφημιαν· δευτερον, την διδουσαν· ηχ' οτι αισχυνη εδουλη, κ. λ. Cat. 6, n. 26.

^o——comparavit sibi puerum annum fere septem, Corbicium nomine, quem statim manumisit, ac literis erudit. Quique cum duodecim annorum esset effectus, anus illa diem obiit, ipsique universa bona sua tradidit. Arch. n. 53. p. 57.

^p Και τ'ετον εις νοβησιαν λαβησα, μεταδιδωσι τοις περτων μαθημασιν ως υιον· και περφοκος ο κακος οικητης εις μισον φιλο-
δοσαν ταμιας· και τελευτησας της χηρας περιμεμνηστος και τα βιβλια και τα χρηματα. Cat. 6, n. 24. ^q Μανης γαρ εστι διδωλος. Aristoph. Av. ver. 1329. et passim. Γε-
λοιον εστι, ει Μανης μιν χωρις Διογονους ζη-

Διογονους δε χωρις Μανι ου δυναται. Diog. Laert. l. 6, n. 55. Vid. Menag. in locum, et in l. 5, n. 55. Conf. Senec. de Tranq. Anim. c. 8. Vid. et Suid. V. Μανης, cum Kusteri notis, et Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 281, 282. ^r Manes Persa, in eorum libris dictus Mani pictor. Nam talis fuit professione sua. Hyde ubi supra, c. 21, p. 280. ^s Mani. Manes——étoit

peintre et graveur de sa profession. Herbelot Bib. Orient. ^t Orientales aiunt, quod ex pictoriæ artis qua excellabat superbia elatus se prophetam venditaret. Ferunt eum potuisse ad 20 ulnarum longitudinem ducere lineam, in qua applicando normam nulla curvitas deprehendi potuit. Hyde ib. p. 282, m.

^u Ce Manes sçavoit faire quelques pectiges, et avoit la main si juste, qu'il tiroit des lignes, et decroivoit des cercles sans regle et sans compas. Il fit aussi un globe terrestre avec tous ces cercles et ses divisions. Herbelot. ib.

It may be argued that Mani was skilful in the science of astronomy, because Epiphanius says he ^x wrote a book of astrology, and that his followers boasted of their understanding in astronomy.

Augustine too says, that ^y the Manichæan writings were filled with a fabulous philosophy about the heavens and the stars, and the sun and moon. Faustus, however, the Manichæan bishop, did not concern himself with those speculations; which, I think, is to his honour, and seems to shew that as among other sects, so among them likewise, there were doctrines maintained by some, which the wiser and more understanding did not consider as essential parts of their scheme, or at all belonging to it.

Beausobre ^z has shewn it to be probable that Mani believed our earth to have two hemispheres, an upper and a lower, both inhabited; and consequently that there are antipodes. He collects as much from some things said in The ^a Acts of Archelaus; and he refers to a passage of Cosmas Indicopleustes, who says that ^b the Manichees are of much the same opinion with the Greeks, and believe as they do that the heaven is spherical.

Sharistani, an Arabian author in Hyde, calls Mani ^c a learned man, and a philosopher; and another author of the same country says ^d that Mani wrote a system of philosophy, and invented a musical instrument, called by the Arabians Oud.

Beausobre argues that ^e Mani was skilled in medicine; but he has no direct evidence: it is not expressly said by the Greek or eastern writers. And Beausobre does not give credit to the story of his attempt to cure the king of Persia's son. I therefore leave that a doubtful point.

But Mani was learned. This appears from all the particulars just mentioned, and from what is said by the Greek writers of the literary and philosophical ^f education bestowed upon him by the

^x — αλλην δι την περι αστρολογιας η γαρ αποδειξει της τειαντης περιεργιας, αλλα μαλλον αυτοις εν προχειρι καυχηματος προκειται αστρονομια. Har. 66, n. 13, p. 629, D.

^y Libri quoque eorum pleni sunt longissimis fabulis, de cælo et sideribus et sole et luna:—quæ tamen ubi consideranda et discutienda protuli, modeste sane ille nec ausus est subire ipsam farcinam. Noverat enim se ista non nosse, nec eum puduit confiteri. Non erat de talibus, quales multos loquaces passus eram, conantes eam docere, et dicentes nihil. Ille vero cor habebat, etsi non rectum ad te, nec tamen nimis incautum ad seipsum. Conf. l. 5, c. 7, n. 12.

^z Hist. de Manich. T. 2, p. 374—376.

^a Και παλις ειπεν εις τοις κοσμοις τινος, ταν

φασιν αν δυνανται απο της τη κοσμου, εξ αν ανατελλησι. Arch. c. 9. p. 17. Και οι ανθρωποι παντες ριζας εχουσι, κατω συνδεμενοι τοις ανω. ib. c. 8, p. 14. Conf. Lactant. Instit. l. 3. c. 24.

^b Μανχαιοι παραπλησια τοις ελλαιοι φημι, τοις τε θρασοι και αυτοι σφαιριον ημιζοντες, κ. λ. Cosm. l. 6, p. 271, B.

^c Apud Shahristanium—Manes ibn Phaten doctus, seu philosophus. Hyde, p. 280.

^d Ibn Shahna dicit Manetem scripsisse philosophiam, quam vertit in linguam Persicam: eumque extitisse auctorem instrumenti musici dicti Arabibus Oud, id est, Testudo, Chelys. ib. p. 280.

^e T. i. p. 81, 82. ^f — εις μετα φιλοσοφου ηκμαζε. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 24.

p. 130.

good widow, into whose hands he came. And in The Acts of Archelaus he is spoken of as ^s if he was equal to the most knowing among the Persians, or was the first man of his time among them for learning.

I shall now translate a long article in Herbelot, taken from eastern authors, who say that ‘Mani^h, having gained some esteem, began to gather together a number of people, in the character of disciples, who opposed the worship and ceremonies of the religion of Zoroaster, which the Persians professed at that time. This novelty having occasioned some disturbances, Sapor would have had him punished; but Mani, perceiving that he was sought for, fled and retired into Turkestan: here he had full scope to spread his notions among an ignorant sort of people, and make himself pass among them for a wonderful man, or even a god. Having found a cave where was a fine spring, he got some provisions, sufficient for a year, to be lodged there: and then he told his disciples that he was about to take a journey to heaven, and that they would be a whole year without seeing him; after which time he would come down again from heaven, and appear in a certain cave which he told them of.

‘At the end of the year they failed not to look for him, and found him at the appointed place. Then he shewed them that wonderful book, filled with uncommon images and figures, and called Ergenk and Estenk, which he said he had brought from heaven. This new imposture greatly increased the number of his followers, who all went from Turkestan into Persia upon the death of Sapor.

‘Hormisdas, having succeeded his father Sapor, used Mani very kindly: he even embraced his sect, and built him a castle for his security.

‘Baharam, or Varanes, succeeding his father Hormisdas, appeared in the beginning of his reign to favour Mani: but, having got him out of his castle under a pretence of disputing with the doctors of the Zoroastrian sect, he soon after slayed him alive, filled his skin with chaff, and had it hung up in a conspicuous place to terrify those of his sect: whereupon the greatest part of his followers fled into India, and some even to China. All that staid in Persia lost their liberty, and were reduced to servitude.’

The same story is told in ⁱ Hyde from the same historian

Ee 3

Condemir,

^s ———eruditus secundum doctrinam, quæ in locis illis est, et pene dixerim super eum hominem. Arch. n. 53, p. 98.

^h Vid. Herbelot. Bib. Or. v. Mani.

ⁱ Persarum historicus Chondemir narrat, quod Manes, Seducus, fuit egregius

Condemir, or Khondemir, with only some few variations. As Hyde's book is not very common, I have transcribed his words at the bottom of the page.

I think it may be best to make here a few remarks, omitting others, which might be mentioned, and possibly may be remembered at another time.

1. The eastern authors, quoted in Hyde's and Herbelot's collections, are not ancient, but rather modern: for they are either Mahometans, or Christians of late times.

2. The eastern writers declare Mani to have been a Christian. It seems to be implied in Khondemir's account, as it stands in Herbelot: but it is plainly intimated at the beginning of his article in Hyde: and Sharistani, cited by Hyde, says that ^k Mani received the prophecy or religion of Jesus, but not that of Moses.

3. The eastern writers agree with the Greeks in representing Mani as an impostor, or one that pretended to prophecy and inspiration.

4. If these writers are to be relied upon, Mani improved his skill in painting for gaining, or supporting the reputation of his being a prophet, or some extraordinary person. This is more than once taken notice of ^l by Hyde, who likewise speaks particularly ^m of the painted, finely-figured book of his Revelations, called Ertengh.

5. According to the eastern, as well as the Greek writers, Mani was put to death by a king of Persia; so Khondemir, before

gius pictor et sculptor: qui postquam audierat quod Jesus se missurum paracletum declarasset, diabolus lapideæ cordis ejus tabulæ insculpsit suggestionem, ipsum esse dictum paracletum. Quod tempore Shabur filii Ardeshar Babecam prophetiam jactabat: cumque Shabar eum interficere quereretur, aufugit in Turkistan, ubi multos seduxit. Postea ibi inveniens speluncam, ubi optimæ aquæ fons erat, ibi clanculum reposuit annonam ad unius anni spatium duraturam, et affectis suis prætendebat, se ad cælum ascensurum, et post unius anni spatium se rursus ad eos descensurum. Quocirca seipsum ab eis subducens, in dictam speluncam abiit, ibique ad præstitutum tempus permanfit. Et deinde rursus comparens, produxit tabulas egregie pictas, quas Ertengh-Mani vocant, affirmans se eas a cælo accepisse: unde plurimi ei fidem adhibuere. Deinde in Persidem festinans Regem Behram ad suam religionem invitavit. Et quidem Rex fuit ex primis qui ejus dictis fidem adhibuit. Et

cum affectæ ejus multi evaderent, Magorum doctoribus præcepit, ut cum eo disputarent. At tandem omnes qui servitio ejus addicti erant, Regis Behram jussu occisi sunt, et fervor ejus ignis hoc modo extinctus. Hyde de Rel. V. Pers. cap. 21, p. 282, 283.

^k — Ille amplexus est religionem inter Magismum et Christianismum, asserens prophetiam Christi, sed non asserens prophetiam Moysis. Apud Hyde, p. 282.

^l Orientales aiunt, quod ex pictoriæ artis, qua excellebat superbia elatus, se prophetam venditavit. ib. p. 282.

^m Utcunque tamen fuerit, impius iste Mani, cum esset professione pictor, impiorum suorum dogmatum librum, ut speciosior appareret oculis, et eo nomine multo gravior esset, eleganter qua potuit pinxit, et varii generis picturis ornavit et decoravit, et Persice illum vocavit Ertengh, vel abbreviate Tengh — ibi intelligendum est Manetis Evangelium pictum, seu Ertengh sc. picturarum liber, in quo dogmata sua et revelationes scripsit. ib. p. 281, 282.

transcribed;

p. 134.

transcribed; and ^a so likewise Shariftani: but the Persian and Arabian authors make Mani's death owing to his zeal for religious principles, or the disturbances occasioned thereby. Thus Khondemir, as we have seen. And Hyde says it ^o is certain that Varanes put to death the dualists, or those who maintained two principles, and hung up Mani at the gate of the city. These writers say nothing of Mani's having occasioned the death of the king of Persia's son: they seem not to have had any the least knowledge of that matter.

6. I must take notice of a mistake of these writers; for according to them the place of Mani's retirement was China; where likewise they say he had several churches finely painted. But ^p Hyde says they must or should mean Turkestan; for Mani never was in China. This we should not have been able to perceive from Herbelot, who seems to have concealed and disguised this mistake of his authors. He declares indeed that they speak of Mani's followers going into India and China after his death; but as for the place of his retirement, when he fled from Sapor, one would have thought that they had called it Turkestan, whereas it seems they name China. This may be collected from Hyde, and must lessen the credit and authority of those writers.

Perhaps some may suspect that by China those writers mean what we call Turkestan. To which I answer; if so this remark is of no value: but I am confirmed in the persuasion of it's solidity by a passage of Abulpharagius, who says that Mani ^q sent his twelve disciples into all the countries of the east, even as far as India and China: where by China he must, I think, mean the same country that we call by that name; but if he does, very probably it is a mistake.

Turkestan ^r is said to be a country containing several provinces, or small kingdoms: it is situated on the east of the Caspian sea, and borders upon Sogdiana.

^a Shahriftani in libro de Religionibus Orientis de eo refert: Mani apparuit tempore Shabur filii Ardeshir, et occidit eum Behram filius Hormuz filii Shabur. ib. p. 282.

^o Sic ille; nam Rex Behram interfecit dualistas, et Manetem in porta urbis crucifixit. p. 283.

^p Apud Rustemi epitomatore legitur. — Tchigil est picturarum domus Chinenfis, scil. illud delubrum, quod in regno Chinæ Manes magister pinxit. Quod autem dicunt de China, intelligendum est de Turkestan, ubi Manes commoratus est. Et ibidem

est alia ecclesia dicta Ghalbila, quam Manes picturis ornavit. Et ibi est urbs Tchigil. Ille enim nunquam fuit in China. Hyde p. 281.

^q Deinde a fide descissens, seipsum Messiam nominavit, et duodecim discipulos sibi adscitos in omnes Orientis regiones, Indiam usque et Sinam misit, qui in ipsis doctrinam Thanawiorum seminarent; sc. duos esse in mundo deos. — Abulph. Dynast. p. 82.

^r See Beaufobre T. i. p. 187. See likewise the article of Turkestan in Herbelot's Bibliothèque Orientale.

II. I now proceed to what I formerly proposed to do in this place; which is to settle the time of the rise of the Manichæan sect; or, if that cannot be done, to shew at least the sentiments of ancients and moderns about it.

We have already seen the sentiments of two learned ancients. Eusebius, ^s or Jerom, said that Manichæism rose in the second year of Probus, the year of Christ 277; Socrates ^t not long before the reign of Constantine. I shall now shew the sentiments of divers others.

Jerom elsewhere says it ^u is certain that the Manichees appeared before the council of Nice.

Augustine, that ^x this sect did not arise until after Tertullian, and even after Cyprian. In another place he says that ^y Cyprian obtained the crown of martyrdom before Manichæism was at all known in the Roman empire. It is likely that Augustine thought he spoke within compass. However, if we should not be able to be more exact than this with full certainty, it is of importance to be assured, that as this sect evidently appeared in the Roman empire before the council of Nice, so it did not arise in the world until after Cyprian, who was ordained bishop about the year of Christ 248, and obtained the crown of martyrdom in 258.

In The Acts of Archelaus ^z the reign of Probus is several times mentioned as the time of Mani's appearing, or the time of the dispute with him; soon after which he was put to death.

Cyril of Jerusalem, who wrote his Catechetical Lectures about the year 347, observes that ^a the Manichæan heresy arose not very long ago, about seventy years, and that there were then men living who had seen Mani. In another place he speaks ^b of Mani's not appearing till the apostles had been dead two hundred years. Toutée supposes Cyril to mean the year of Christ 277, which was the second of Probus; and that he computed the apostolic age to have ended about the year of Christ 77. It may

^s p. 375. ^t p. 376. ^u Alioqui hoc argumento, — nec Marcion, nec Cataphryges, nec Manichæus damnari debent: quia Synodus Nicæna eos non nominat: quos certe ante Synodum fuisse non dubium est. Hieron. ad Panm. et Ocean. Ep. 41 al. 65, p. 344, in.

^x Nam constat, non solum post Tertullianum, verum etiam post Cyprianum, hanc hæresim exortam. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 12, c. 4, in. Ecce prædicatissimus tractator divinatorum eloquiorum [Cyprianus] antequam terras nostras vel tenuissimus odor Manichææ pestilentie tetigisset. Id. Contr. duas Ep. Pelag. l. 4, c. 8, n. 24.

^y — numquid et gloriosissimæ coronæ Cyprianus dicitur ab aliquo, non solum fuisse, sed vel esse potuisse Manichæus, cum prius iste sit passus, quam illa in orbe Romano pestis apparuit? De Nuptiis et Concup. l. 2, c. 29, n. 51.

^z — sub Probo demum Romano imperatore. — Arch. n. 27, p. 46. Vid. n. 28, init.

^a — τον παρῶν ἐπὶ πρὸς βασιλεὺς ἀρξάμενος· πρὸ γὰρ οὐκ ἐδραμύνετο ἡ αἰὼν ἡ πόλις καὶ εἰς μέχρη τῆς νῦν αἰῶνες αὐτοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς θεωροῦντες ἐκινῶν. Cat. 6, n. 20. ^b ἀρὰ οἱ τελευταῖοι τῆς ἀποστολῆς ἀπὸ διακονίας αὐτῶν ἐξεδέχοντο μαρτυρῆσαι; — Cat. 16, n. 9.

p. 139.

be also supposed that Cyril took his date of Manichæism from The Acts of Archelaus, where Mani's coming is placed under the emperor Probus.

Epiphanius is not consistent with himself, placing Mani earlier at one time than another. In one of his works he says that ^c Mani came from Persia, and disputed with Archelaus in the ninth of Valerian and Gallienus; that is, in the year of our Lord 261 or 262; which date is also in ^d Photius. But, in his work Against Heresies, Epiphanius sometimes mentions ^e the fourth of Aurelian; that is, the year 273 or 274; at other times ^f the reigns of Aurelian and Probus; that is, about the year 276. Moreover, Epiphanius, who wrote about the year 376, says he ^g had conversed with persons who were acquainted with Hermias, disciple of Mani.

Pope Leo ^h placeth the rise of Manichæism in the consulate of Probus and Paulinus, or the year 277.

In the Edeffen Chronicle ⁱ, published by Asseman, Mani's birth is placed at the year of our Lord 240, a thing not mentioned, that we know of, any where ^k else.

Alexander of Lycopolis mentions it as a common report that ^l Mani lived in the time of the emperor Valerian, who was taken captive by the Persians in ^m the year 259; that he went to the wars with Sapor king of Persia; and, having by some means displeased the king, was put to death by him.

Having put down so many accounts from ancient authors, I shall now mention the opinions of moderns.

The general opinion, as Asseman owns, is, that ⁿ Mani disputed with Archelaus in the year 277, and died in 278. To the like purpose ^o Tillemont, and ^p Basnage, and others. And Zacagni

^c — ἐν τῇ ἐνάτῃ ἡ ἐν τῇ τῆς τῆτων βασιλείᾳ πρὸς μακρὴν ἀπὸ τῆς περιόδου, κ. λ. De Menf. et Pond. c. 20, p. 176, A.

^d Contr. Manich. l. i, c. 15, in.

^e περὶ τοῦ τεταρτοῦ τῆς αὐτῆς [αὐρηλιανῆς] βασιλείας. Hær. 66, c. i. in.

^f ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ προδηλωθέντῃ αὐρηλιανῇ τῇ καὶ πρὸς, ἐν ᾗ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ μακρὸς ἐγνώρισε. κ. λ. ib. c. 19, f. vid. et n. 20, p. 677, D. Περὶ τοῦ δὲ καὶ οὐ κατ' ἐκεῖνον καιρὸν βασιλεῖς, καὶ αὐρηλιανὸς ὁ πρὸ αὐτῆς, οὗτος ὁ μακρὸς ἐνόηται. ib. n. 77, in.

^g ἐκ ἐνὶ γὰρ ἀρχαίᾳ ἡ αἰρεσίς, καὶ οἱ ἐπιτιμῆντες τῇ προειρημένῃ ἑμμελῇ, μακάριον οὖν τῇ μακρῇ, ἡμῶν τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς διηγέσθαι. H. 66, n. 12.

^h Manichæus ego magister falsitatis diabolicæ, et conditor superstitionis obsecra, eo tempore damnandus innotuit. — Probo Impatore Paulinoque Consulibus. Leo Hom.

2. de Pentec. cap. 7.

ⁱ Anno quingentesimo quinquagesimo primo natus est Manes. Chr. Ed. ap. Assem. Bib. Orient. T. i. p. 393.

^k — natus enim fuit juxta Chronicon nostrum anno Græcorum 551, Christi 240, quod nemini hætenus de ejus natali observatum. Assem. ib. in notis.

^l αὐτὸς ἐπὶ οὐαλεριανῇ μὲν γεγενῆσθαι λέγεται, συγγράττωσθαι τὴν σαφῆσιν τῶν πειρῶν προσκεκταντὰ δὲ τὴν τῆτων ἀπολωλεναι. Alex. lyc. p. 4, A.

^m Vid. Pagi Crit. in Bar. 259, n. 7, et seqq. Basnag. Ann. 259, n. 3.

ⁿ Deinde communior fert scriptorum opinio, eam disputationem anno Christi 277, Manetis interitum anno 278, accidisse. Bib. Or. T. 3. P. 2, p. 45.

^o Mem. Ec. T. 4, Les Manicheens, art. 7, et 12, et note v.

^p Ann. 277, n. 3, etc. Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 262, 281.

observes

observes that^a whereas Epiphanius, in the work first quoted above, placed the dispute of Archelaus and Mani in the ninth of Valerian and Gallienus, he afterwards followed a later date in his work *Against all Heresies*, having then obtained better information. But Asselman^r prefers the first account of Epiphanius, followed by Photius and others; though then, if Mani was born in 240, he must have finished his course when he was little more than twenty years of age; which, surely, must appear improbable to most persons.

Tillemont never saw the Edeffen Chronicle: but having taken notice of what Alexander says of Mani's living in the time of Valerian, he adds, that^s in order to reconcile him with Jerom's Chronicle, we may suppose Mani to have been in an advanced age in 277, when he was put to death; and then he may easily have gained reputation in Persia before the year 260.

Beaufobre does not disallow it to be probable that^t Manichæism began to be known in the Roman empire about the year 277, the time fixed in Jerom's Chronicle; but it may have arisen^u eight or ten years sooner in Persia. Nor is it, he says, very improbable that^x Mani might be author of a new sect by that time he was thirty years of age: for more he could not be, admitting the authority of the Edeffen Chronicle concerning the time of his birth, as Beaufobre does: nay, he supposeth that^y Mani might make a figure in 267.

Touttée observes that, ^z since Cyril says in his time there were persons

^a Dicendum itaque est, Epiphanium in libro de Mensuris et ponderibus errasse, et multo certiora de Manichæorum hæresis exortu in libris adversus hæreses nobis tradidisse, licet in eisdem quoque libris iterum sibi non constare deprehendatur. Zacagn. Pr. n. 8, p. 9.

^r Hujus hæreseos initium accurate describitur a S. Epiphanio lib. de Mensuris et Ponderibus. Asselm. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 393, not. 2. Atqui ex Epiphanio, Photio, et Petro Siculo, Manes ex Persarum carceribus in Mesopotamiam anno Gallieni nono, id est Christi 261, aufugit. Anno igitur sequenti, vel ad summum anno 263, dignis impietatis sue pœnas persequitur; idque anno ætatis sue circiter vigesimo tertio, si auctori Chronici Edeffeni credendum, qui illum, ut supra dixi, natum scribit anno Christi 240. Asselm. ib. T. 3, P. 2, p. 45.

^s Les Manichéens, Note v. fin.

^t See Beauf. Vol. i. p. 121, 122.

^u J'explique tous ces passages, non du tems de la naissance du Manichéisme, qui avoit commencé en Perse environ dix ans

auparavant, mais du tems, ou cette heresie commença de faire du bruit dans l'Empire. Beauf. T. i. p. 123.

^x Je ne voi point de raison assez forte, pour rejeter le temoignage de la Chronique d'Edessè, sur le tems de la naissance de Manes. — Or ce prince [Sapor] étant mort en l'année 271 ou en 272, il ne pouvoit avoir alors que trentedeux, ou trente trois ans. Il est vrai encore, que l'on peut être surpris que Manes soit devenu chef de secte, étant encore si jeune. Mais ces raisons ne sauroient balancer le temoignage d'un auteur Syrien, ou Mesopotamien, qui paroît bien instruit des faits, qui se sont passés en Orient. Beauf. T. i. p. 65.

^y J'en ai marqué le tems à l'année deux cens soixante sept, en quoi j'ai suivi Apulpharage, qui temoigne, qu'elle parût sons Aurelien. Ib. p. 186, in.

^z Is est annus 277, a Christi nativitate. Non esse in anteriora tempora retrahendum Manetis exortum argumento est id quod Cyrillus subjicit, fuisse adhuc suo tempore superstites, qui Manetem ipsi suis oculis

p. 144.

persons living who had seen Mani, we cannot reasonably place the dispute with him before the year 277, at which time his heresy was first brought into the Roman empire, and in the following year he was put to death: which, I think, cannot be denied by those who have any regard for The Acts of^a Archelaus.

Cave therefore is somewhat singular when he says that^b Mani began to spread his notions in 277, and^c lived to near the end of that century; and yet he may be thought to have some reason for that supposition, when it is recollected that in Cyril's time there were some who had seen Mani; in Epiphanius's, some who had conversed with his disciple Hermias; provided those authors may be depended upon.

Pagi approves^d of the date in Jerom's Chronicle, but says that, according to the success and progress of this doctrine in several places, authors have spoken differently concerning the time of it.

For my own part, I think it very difficult to determine exactly the time of the rise of Manichæism in Persia, or of it's first appearance in the Roman empire: and I am apt to think that most considerate persons may be in suspense here. It is evident from the letter of Arius, and the testimonies of Jerom and Augustine, that Manichæism was known in the Roman empire before the council of Nice, and not till after the time of Cyprian. As for the edict of Dioclesian, I am not satisfied about it's genuineness. What ground Eusebius, or rather Jerom, in the Chronicle, had for fixing Manichæism at the second year of Probus, we cannot now certainly say; excepting only the authority of The Acts of Archelaus, which there is not much reason to think that Eusebius was acquainted with. It appears to me remarkable that Alexander of Lycopolis, who, as is said, once was a Manichee, and afterwards wrote against them, speaks not with assurance about Mani's time. The little notice taken of Manichæism by Eusebius is another thing that deserves observation; as do likewise

oculis conspexissent. Quod autem sub Probo innotuit Manes, intelligendum de eius in Mesopotamiam et Romanorum imperium adventu, qui uno tantum anno eius necem antecessit. Toutt. ad Cyr. Cat. 6, p. 99, not. 3.

^a Vid. Arch. n. 55, p. 100.

^b Hæresin suam disseminare cœpit circa ann. 277. Probi imperatoris anno secundo. H. L. T. i. p. 139, in Manete.

^c Infantiæ suæ virus non ante annum 277, propinare cœpit Manes, et plures postea annos in vivis erat, ac proinde ad

exitum vergente hoc sæculo Agapium sibi discipulum adscivit. Cav. Diss. de Script. incertæ æt. sub. in.

^d In Annalibus origo hæreseos Manichæorum anno præcedenti consignatur, sed eam ad præsentem retrahendam esse evincit Eusebius in Chronico. Pagi Ann. 277, n. vi. Verum est, varias sub idem fere tempus eruptiones monstri illius fuisse, et insignibus alicujus facinoris notis celebratas. Quæ causâ fuit, cur non iidem Imperatoribus hæresis istius origo mandata fuerit. Ib. n. vii,

the

the words of Cyril and Epiphanius, where they speak of Mani or Hermias having been personally known to some of their times: insomuch that, upon the whole, I am doubtful whether Manichæism was known in the Roman empire before the very end of the third century, or the beginning of the fourth. If it was known there sooner, I think it's progress must have been very inconsiderable.

SECT. III. MANI's predecessors and works.

I. *His predecessors*; 1. *Scythian*; 2. *Terebinthus*. II. *His works*.

It will be proper, in the next place, to give an account of Mani's works.

I. But it is requisite that I beforehand take notice of two persons spoken of as Mani's predecessors, and ^a sometimes called his masters, Scythian and Terebinthus; both expressly named in the long passage of Socrates, transcribed at the beginning of this chapter.

1. It has been the prevailing opinion of learned men that Scythian lived in the apostolic age, or near it. Epiphanius ^b placeth him near the times of the apostles; which ^c Cave thinks may be understood with so great latitude as to leave room to suppose that Scythian lived to near the end of the second century.

In The Acts of Archelaus, Scythian is said ^d to have lived in the time of the apostles: but that seems not very consistent with what follows, where ^e it is said that Terebinthus was a disciple of Scythian, and intimate with him: and Mani, who appeared not in the world till after the middle of the third century, is said to have been the slave and adopted son of the woman at whose house Terebinthus died.

Indeed there is reason to believe that Scythian was contempo-

^a ——— τῆς μανιῆτος διδασκαλῆς. Vid. Ananhem. ap. Coteler. Clem. Recogn. l. 4, c. 27, in.

^b ——— περὶ τῆς χρόνης τῶν ἀποστόλων. H. 66, n. 3, p. 620, A.

^c Tradit Epiphanius ipsum Hierosolyma profectum περὶ τῆς χρόνης τῶν ἀποστόλων. [H. 66, n. 3, p. 620, A.] Quod laxiore quidem sensu de sæculo ævum apostolicum proxime secuto intelligendum est; adeo ut vergente ad exitum sæculo secundo diem fatalem obiisse censei potest. Cav.

H. l. T. i. p. 140. Oxon. 1740.

^d Scythianus nomine apostolorum tempore fuit sectæ hujus auctor et princeps.

——— Arch. n. 51, p. 95.

^e Discipulum habuit quendam nomine Terebinthum. Arch. n. 52, p. 96. ——— quia ergo aliquantulum temporis secum isti ambo decreverunt soli habitare; ——— Ille vero discipulus, qui cum eo fuerat conversatus, ——— ib.

p. 149.

rary with Mani, as ^f some learned men have perceived; for ^g in Photius is express mention made of a ^{*} letter of Mani to Scythian.

Archelaus in one place says that ^h Scythian was of the country of Scythia: but afterwards he says he ⁱ was a Saracen or Arabian; which is also said by ^k Cyril and ^l Epiphanius. Photius too says, not very differently from ^m Archelaus, that Scythian ⁿ was descended from the Saracens, but chose to live in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria.

2. Terebinthus, reckoned another predecessor of Mani, is said by ^o Epiphanius to have been a learned man as well as Scythian. The common account of this man in ^p Archelaus, ^q Cyril, ^r Epiphanius, and others, is, that after the death of his master Scythian he went into Persia, or the country of Babylon, where he changed his name from Terebinthus to Buddas; and gave out that he was born of a virgin, and brought up by an angel in the mountains; and that at last he was thrown off the top of a house by ^s an angel, or some other spirit, where he had gone up very early one morning to perform some sacred rites.

As for his changing his name, in all probability there was no bad design in that, Buddas ^t being in the Babylonian language equivalent to Terebinthus, which in Greek signifies a certain tree.

What is said of his pretending to have been born of a virgin, and educated in the mountains, must needs be a fiction; because, as ^u Beaufobre observes, the Manichees universally denied the

^f Hunc Scythianum Manetis adhuc ætate vixisse non dubito, licet ætate ætate ac senio eum præcessit. — Certe ex Manetis epistola ad Scythianum fragmentum a me infra afferetur. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 280. Vid. et Beaufobre Hist. des Manich. T. i. p. 26, et 63.

^g Καὶ μὴν καὶ ὁ μανιχαῖος πρὸς σκυθίαν ἀπελλέει — ap. Phot. in Eulogio cod. 230, p. 849.

^{*} See a French translation of the fragment of that letter in B. T. i. p. 45.

^h — quidam ex Scythia, Scythianus nomine. Arch. n. 51, p. 95.

ⁱ Quique Scythianus ipse ex genere Saracenorum fuit, et captivam quandam accepit uxorem de superiore Thebaide, quæ eum suavit habitare in Ægypto, magis quam in desertis. ib. n. 52, p. 95.

^k — σαρακηνὸς τὸ γένος. Cat. 6, n. 22.

^l — ἀπὸ τῆς σαρακηνίας ἀναγόμενος. H. 66, n. 1.

^m See before note ⁱ. ⁿ Σκυθίαν τις τῶν πατρίδα αἰγυπτίως, τὸ δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γένος σαρακηνὸς τὴν ἀλεξάνδριαν ὤκει. Ph. contr. Manich. l. 1. c. 12, in.

^o καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν γραμμασί τιμι-

λαστά πεπαιδευμένος. H. 66, n. 3, p. 620, D.

^p — et Babyloniam petiit, quæ nunc provincia habetur a Persis, — quo cum venisset, talem de se famam per vulgavit ipse Terebinthus, dicens — se — vocari non jam Terebinthum, sed alium Buddam nomine, — ex quadam autem virgine natum se esse, simul et ab angelo in montibus enutritum. — Tunc deinde mane primo ascendit solarium quoddam excelsum, ubi nomina quædam cœpit invocare. — Hæc eo cogitante iustissimus Deus sub terras eum detrudi per spiritum jubet, et continuo de summo dejectus, exanime corpus deorsum præcipitatum est, quod anus illa miserta collectum locis solitis sepeliit. Arch. c. 52, p. 97. ^q Cyr. Cat. vi. n. 23.

^r Hæc. 66, n. 3. ^s — ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου καταχθὺς κατέπιπτε. Epiph. ib. p. 621, A.

^t Qui in Persiam concedens, ut melius celaretur, transulit nomen suum in Buddam, (rectius Butm, seu Budm,) Terebinthum significans. Hyde, p. 280, Conf. Beauf. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 53, 54, 55. ^u T. i. p. 56.

possibility

possibility of such a birth, and always supposed that ^x Mani himself was born in the ordinary way.

As for the manner of his death, there is no reason to receive the account of it as true, from those who have suffered themselves to be imposed upon in so many particulars: but it is not improbable that Terebinthus often went to the upper part of the house to perform his devotions there; the Manichees being frequent in prayer, and the top of the house ^y being a place much used for that purpose by the eastern people. Whether Terebinthus died suddenly in such a place I do not know.

Finally, whereas it is said that Terebinthus outlived Scythian, and that having died himself at the house of a widow, who, coming to the possession of his estate, purchased the boy Cubricus, or Mani, then seven years of age, it must be all without foundation; for Scythian himself was contemporary with Mani, and alive after that Mani had published his peculiar opinions, as has been shewn. Moreover, Terebinthus, or Buddas, or Addas, was a disciple of Mani: his name is in all catalogues of the first disciples of that Persian master, and he wrote in defence of his scheme. And by Scythian may then be meant Mani, who, as ^z Theodoret says, was sometimes so called; possibly, because he was a while in that country.

Let this suffice for shewing that the common accounts concerning these two predecessors of Mani are not to be relied upon, but are really idle fictions.

I have already several times quoted Beaufobre. I here again refer to his History of the Manichees.

II. We come now to Mani's works, of which I shall give the best account I can.

Socrates, in the passage formerly cited, speaks of four books written by Terebinthus or Buddas, entitled Mysteries, The Gospel, The Treasure, and Chapters. By ^b Cyril, and ^c Epiphanius, and ^d Photius, they are ascribed to Scythian, as they are also in The ^e Acts of Archelaus. But there being an ambiguity in one place of that work ^f where they are mentioned, it is likely that

^x ——— cur hominem susceptum a Spiritu Sancto Manichæum, non putatis turpe, natum ex utroque sexu prædicare? Aug. contr. Ep. Fund. c. 7, n. 8. Cum enim vos non timeatis viscera et sanguinem Manichæi de humano concubitu venientem, ——— id. ib. Vid. et Alex. Lyc. p. 14, D. ^y See Beaufobre, T. i. p. 60.

^z σκυθιανός δι δαδευας προσσηγορευτο. Har. Fab. l. i. c. 26, in.

^a T. i. p. 53—64.

^c Har. 66, n. 2.

^b Cat. 6, n.

^d Ph. contr.

Manich. l. i. c. 12.

^e ——— etiam quatuor illos libellos, quos Scythianus scripserat, non multorum versuum singulos. Arch. n. 53, p. 97.

^f Discipulum autem habuit [Scythianus] quendam nomine Terebinthum, qui scripsit ei quatuor libros, ex quibus unum quidem appellavit Mysteriorum, alium vero Capitulum, tertium autem Evangelium, et novissimum omnium Thesaurum appellavit. Arch. n. 52, p. 96.

p. 154.

thereby Socrates was induced to call them Terebinthus's, as has been hinted by ⁸ some learned men.

Socrates says that Mani, coming to the possession of those books, distributed them among his followers as his own. Archelaus ^h speaks to the like purpose; only he says that Mani first made additions to them. It seems to me probable that they are really Mani's; and I shall consider them as such. Beaufobre does the same.

The four books, mentioned by Socrates, are differently placed by the authors just cited. I chuse to speak of them in the order in which they are named by Archelaus and Epiphanius: Mysteries, Chapters, Gospel, Treasury. Afterwards I shall put down the titles of other things ascribed to him.

1. The first is The Mysteries. 'It appears,' says ⁱ Beaufobre, 'by comparing Titus of Bostra and Epiphanius, that it began with these words: "God ^k and matter existed, light and darkness, good and evil: they were entirely separate and contrary to each other." This book was divided into ^l two-and-twenty sections, according to the number of the letters of the Syriac alphabet. As for the subject of the book, Photius ^m says the author there blasphemed the law and the prophets. But that was not the principal design of this pernicious work: it is the doctrine of two principles that Mani there endeavoured to prove by a demonstration a posteriori: I mean from the mixture of good and evil which there is in the world. All his reasoning is founded upon this maxim, that if there were one sole cause, who is most simple, most perfect, most good, all effects would be answerable to the nature and will of that cause; the whole would shew his simplicity, his perfection, his goodness; and every thing would be immortal, holy, happy, like himself. We may with assurance conclude what were the contents of this book, The Mysteries, from the confutation of it by Titus of Bostra; who follows his adversary very closely, though he does not concern himself minutely with every ⁿ thing.'

Some learned men, as ^o Cave, and ^p Fabricius, thought that Mani wrote a book Concerning the Faith. They suppose it to

⁸ Scythianus——discipulum habuit Terebinthum, qui alio nomine Buddam se vocavit, scripsitque ei (hoc est ab eo dictos) quatuor libros. Fabr. Bid. Gr. T. v. p. 280. Vid. et Touttée in Cyr. not. 2, p. 101. et confer. Beauf. T. i. p. 46, m. ^h Tunc assumit illos libellos, et transfert eos, ita ut multa alia a semetipso insereret eis——nomen vero libellis proprium adscribit, prioris nomine deleto, tanquam

si eos solus ex semetipso conscripserit. Arch. n. 53, p. 98. ⁱ B. T. i. p. 46, 47.

^k Ἦν θεὸς καὶ οὐκ ἦν φῶς, καὶ σκοτὸς ἀγαθὸς, καὶ κακὸς ἐν τοῖς πασὶν ἀνθρώποις. Tit. contr. Manich. l. i. p. 63, in. et ap. Epiph. H. 66, n. 14, in.

^l Epiph. H. 66, n. 13, p. 629, C. D.

^m Ph. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 12, p. 40.

ⁿ What Beaufobre says farther of this book may be seen T. i. p. 427.

be quoted by Epiphanius. But Beaufobre well argues that ^a the passage in Epiphanius is taken out of the book of The Mysteries, as appears by comparing him with Titus of Bostra. I think Epiphanius does not intend a book different from others there named, but says that in the books mentioned by him, particularly that of The Mysteries, Mani shews what was his faith or doctrine.

I therefore shall not speak of this as a distinct book of Mani, as some have done.

2. The second book is that called Chapters or Heads; summarily representing, it is likely, the fundamental principal articles of the Manichæan doctrine. Beaufobre ^r puts the question, whether this be not The Epistle of the Foundation. As I see no reason for such a supposition, I shall speak of that afterwards among Mani's epistles.

3. The third book was entitled The Gospel; which, as Cyril says, did ^s not contain the history of the life of Christ, but resembled the gospels in name only. We might be apt to conclude from those words of Cyril that he had seen the book; but perhaps he speaks only by way of conjecture; as ^t Photius seems to have done when he says that ^u therein were related things derogatory to the honour of Christ our Saviour. I suppose this to be the same book which is sometimes called ^x The Living Gospel. Beaufobre says ^y it was a collection of Mani's meditations and pretended revelations. But I cannot see how he should know this, when he adds that it was written in Persic, and probably was never translated into Greek: and in another place he says that ^z he has not observed any fragments of it in the authors that have confuted Mani. I suppose that conjectural conclusion is built upon the story of Mani's journey to heaven, spoken of by eastern authors, for which I see no good foundation. For my own part I cannot say what was in the book; I know nothing of it beside the title.

4. The fourth is called The Treasure, and ^a Treasure of Life, and ^b The Treasures in the plural number, as if there were more than one: a greater, perhaps, and a less. Epiphanius speaks of a book called The little Treasury, as distinct from that called The Treasure:

^a H. l. T. i. p. 139.

^p Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 282.

^q T. i. p. 426, 427.

^r ib. p. 48, in. ^s ————εὐαγγέλιον, & χρίστος

πραξίς περιεχέσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς μόνον τῆς

προσηγορίας. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 22.

^t Vit. Toutée not. ^b in Cyr. p. 101.

^u Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 12, p. 40.

^x τὸ τῶν μανichaίων ζων εὐαγγέλιον. ap. Phot. Cod. 85, p. 204, f. Conf. Timoth.

Const. ap. Meurf. Varia Divina p. 117.

et Form. Recip. Manich. ap. Toll. p. 142.

et Cotel. Clem. Recogn. l. 4, c. 27.

^y T. i. p. 48. ^z Ib. p. 426, not. 2.

^a θησαυρός ζωῆς. ap. Phot. contr. Ma-

nich. l. i. p. 40. θησαυρός τῆς ζωῆς. ap.

Meurf. Var. Div. p. 117. et Toll. p. 142.

et Cotel. ubi supra. ^b καὶ τῶν θησαυρῶν

καταλεγει. Phot. Cod. 85, p. 204.

^c Ἐτεῖρα δὲ θησαυρός· καὶ ἀλλὰς δὲ θη-

p. 158.

Treasure: perhaps it was an abridgment of the former; but we cannot be certain. The Treasure was one of the books which were confuted by ^d Heracleon. Beaufobre thinks that ^e the pompous title of The Treasure, or Treasure of Life, might be an allusion to some words of Christ, where he compares his doctrine to a treasure hid in a field: See Matth. xiii. 44. Augustine ^f and the author ^g De Fide, joined with Augustine's works, allege a passage as taken out of The Treasure: but ^h Beaufobre says it is not genuine, and offers very weighty arguments against it. As I do not intend to examine all the notions of the Manichees, I shall have no occasion to consider that passage.

5. By Epiphanius, Mani is said to have written ⁱ a book about astrology: it is likely he means astronomy.

6. In Photius is a book entitled ^k The Gigantic Book: it is one of the three books of Mani which were confuted by Heracleon: the other two are The Gospel and The Treasures. Timothy of Constantinople mentions a Manichæan book, entitled ^l The Giant's Enterprize: very probably he means the same with that just taken notice of.

7. Mani's epistles: of which there was a ^m book or ⁿ collection made by somebody.

¹ The first to be observed by us is The Epistle of the Foundation: this was confuted by Augustine, who transcribed the beginning of it into his own ^o works. There is a large fragment of it in another book of ^p Augustine: there are fragments of it also in the ^q treatise De Fide, joined with Augustine's works. It was publicly read by the Manichees in their ^r assemblies. Possibly it was a long epistle; for Augustine ^s calls it a book, and says it contained almost their whole scheme.

There is an epistle to Patricius, cited by ^t Julian the Pelagian, in the Opus Imperfectum of Augustine. Tillemont ^u considers

ὅς κατὰ τὴν φαντασίαν, τὸν μικρὸν δὲ
ἑκατὸν ὡς καλεῖται. Epiph. H. 66, n.
13, p. 619, D. ^d Phot. Cod. 85.

^e Beauf. T. i. p. 49. ^f Aug. de Na-
tura Boni. cap. 44, Vid. et Aët. cum Fe-
lice. l. 2, c. 7, et Contr. Faust. l. 20, c. 6.
^g Cap. 14, &c. ^h Vid. Hist. de Ma-
nich. T. i. p. 49, 426 T. ii. p. 387, &c.

ⁱ ἄλλοι δὲ τὴν περὶ ἀστρολογίας. H. 66, n.
13, p. 619, D. ^k Ἀνατριπὶ δὲ τὸ παρὰ
τῆς μαριχαιῆς καλεῖται ἐναγγέλιον, καὶ
τὸν γιγάντιον βιβλίον, καὶ τὴν ὑπὸ τῆς
Phot. Cod. 85, p. 204.

^l Ἡ τῶν γιγάντων πραγματεία. ap.
Meurf. Var. Div. p. 117. ^m καὶ τὸ τῶν
ἐποικῶν αὐτῆς βιβλίον. ap. Coteler. ubi
ap. et Toll. p. 142. ⁿ ἡ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν
ap. Meurf. ib. p. 117.

^o Vid. Aug. contr. Ep. Manichæi.

^p Vid. De Natura Boni. cap. 46, T. 8.

^q De Fide. cap. v. xi. xxviii.

^r Ipsa enim nobis illo tempore miseris
quando lecta est, illuminati dicebamus a
vobis. Aug. contr. Ep. Man. cap. v. n. 6.

^s Et potissimum illum consideremus li-
brum, quem Fundamenti epistolam di-
citis, ubi totum pene quod creditis conti-
netur. — Aug. ibid.

^t Sic etiam in illa ad Patritium epistola.
ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 186. —

Dixit hoc idem et Manichæus in epistola
ad Patritium. Dixit et in epistola, quam
scripsit ad filiam Menoch. ib. l. 4, c. 109.

^u Mem. Ec. T. iv. Les Manicheens,
Art. 13.

this as different from The Epistle of the Foundation, though he allows that also to have been sent to some particular person. But to me it seems probable that they are one and the same epistle; for, according to the reading ^x in the Benedictine edition of Augustine's Answer, The Epistle of the Foundation appears to be sent to Patticius. Which is the right reading, that in the *Opus Imperfectum* of Augustine, or that in his Answer to The Epistle of the Foundation, I do not determine: but it seems likely that hereby is meant the same name with that of Mani's father: and if Patec, or Phatec, was the name of his father, and of his friend, or disciple, to whom The Epistle of the Foundation was sent, it may afford ground to think that this was a common name among the Persians or Chaldeans.

². A letter to ^y Menoch, a Manichæan woman, found at ^z Constantinople, and ^a often quoted by Julian the Pelagian. I think the genuineness of this letter is not disputed; but ^b Augustine did not know any thing of it till it was quoted against him by Julian.

³. A letter to Marcellus, found in The ^c Acts of Archelaus, and in ^d Epiphanius. Beausobre ^e allows this letter to be genuine: but I think that if those Acts are fictitious, and the history of Mani there recorded is for the most part improbable, and without ground, it will be difficult to maintain this letter. Again, if genuine, it must have been written in Greek, as Beausobre grants. That learned writer has indeed some arguments to prove that Mani understood Greek; but perhaps they are of no great moment: the contents of the letter may increase the suspicion of it's genuineness. It may be doubted whether in writing to a stranger Mani would take upon him his apostolical character, as he here does, unless indeed he means nothing extraordinary by it; and whether he would call one who was not of his opinion his ^f dear son. It seems to me likewise improbable that Mani should reveal his sentiments so clearly to one, who as yet had no knowledge of him; for he declares openly the doctrine of two principles, and his opinion concerning the birth of Christ.

^x De eo igitur, frater dilectissime Pattici, de quo significasti, &c. ap. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich. c. 12, n. 14, ubi subjicitur in ima pagina hoc monitum. Editi, dilectissime, audisti. Vetus codex Corbeienfis ante mille annos scriptus loco audisti, habet Pattici: forte nomen illius, cui epistolam dedit Manichæus.

^y See before, note ¹.

^z Sed quia post editionem illorum, — apud Constantinopolim Manichæi epistola

inventæ est, atque ad has directæ partes, opera est aliqua ejus inferere. ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 166. ^a Ap. Augustin. ib. c. 172, 174, 175, 176, 187, et passim. ^b Si dicam tibi, istam Manichæi epistolam me omnino nescire; quamvis verum dicam, non credes. Aug. Op.

Imp. l. 3, c. 172. ^c Arch. c. v. p. 6, 7. ^d H. 66, c. 6. ^e T. i. p. 94, 95.

^f — τὸν ἀγαπῶν. ap. Arch. p. 6.

p. 164.

and, in speaking of this last, he useth broad and offensive expressions. I might add other observations; but I forbear.

4. A letter to Scythian, cited by Eulogius in ^h Photius. The passage may be likewise seen among some other fragments of Mani's writings in ⁱ Fabricius.

5. An epistle to Zebenna, of which there are two fragments in ^k Fabricius.

6. A letter to Cudarus, of which Fabricius has also a ^l fragment.

7. A letter to Odas [or perhaps Addas, or Buddas]: Fabricius ^m has likewise obliged us with a fragment of this epistle.

8. Augustine ⁿ speaks of an epistle of Mani, containing the strict rules by which the elect ought to govern themselves. By his manner of speaking it appears to have been well known at Rome and in Africa. Whether it was The Epistle of the Foundation, or some other, I cannot say; but I suppose it was not improper just to mention here this particular.

8. In some late writers mention is made of a book entitled ^o Memoirs, or Memorable Sayings and Actions, of Mani; the loss of which is much regretted by ^p Beausobre.

9. Alexander of Lycopolis mentions ^q a book of Mani concerning our Saviour's crucifixion. But it may be questioned whether he means a distinct book, or only that in some book Mani had treated of that subject.

10. An eastern author, cited by Hyde, speaks of a ^r book of philosophy written by Mani.

11. In ^s Photius is quoted a passage as Mani's; it is to this purpose: 'I am not so unmerciful as Christ, who declared, *Him that denies me before men, him also will I deny.* As for me, I say on the other hand: "him that denies me before men, and by lying secures himself, I will receive with joy as if he had not denied me; and his lie and apostacy I will consider as a service to my interest." This saying, with some difference, and not quite so absurd and impudent, is in The Form of abjuring Manichæism, as we have it in ^t Cotelerius, and ^u Tollius. I think that ^v Beausobre is in the right to dispute the genuineness of this passage, found only in late authors, without naming the work

^h χριστον, μαριας τινος γυναικος ελεγον ειναι ταις αιματος και σαρκος, και της αλλης δυσ-
ταξ των γυναικων γεγενησθαι. ib. p. 8.

ⁱ Cod. 280, p. 849, m. ^j Bib. Gr.

^k T. v. p. 284. ^l Ibid.

^m Ib. p. 285. ⁿ Ibid. ^o Proposita

et vivendi regula de Manichæi epistola.

^p Aug. de Mor. Manich. c. 20, n. 74.

^q και την των αποσημασεων (five

Manetis dictorum factorumque memora-

bilium Commentarium.) ap. Tollii In-

sign. p. 142, et Cotel. ubi supra.

^r T. i. p. 430.

^s οπερ αυτος ο μα-
νηαιος διαπραττειται λογον περι της διδασ-

κων. Alex. Lyc. p. 19, B.

^t Ibn Shahna dicit Manetem scripsisse.

Philosophiam, quam vertit in linguam

Persicam. Hyde, p. 283. ^u Ph. contr.

Manich. l. i. c. 8. ^v ubi supra.

^w Toll. ubi supr. p. 143.

^x T. 2, p. 796.

whence it is taken. I am sure it is contrary to the noble saying of Mani, to be alleged by and by ^y from The Acts of Archelaus, where he professes willingness to suffer, and to fear God more than men: it is also contrary to the practice of his followers, who were generally in suffering circumstances for their principles, and yet persevered, and shewed as much constancy as the men of any other sect. Beaufobre ^z has quoted a passage of ^a Secundinus, shewing that the Manichees did not approve of dissimulation, nor of denying the Lord Jesus. Augustine assures us, that ^b the Manichees alleged as genuine words of Christ what is recorded Luke xviii. 29, 30. *There is no man that has left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold.*

Perhaps this impudent saying was in The Memoirs, or Memorable Acts and Sayings, of Mani: if so, Beaufobre had no reason to set any great value upon that piece. Indeed I suspect the collection with that name to have been a late thing; and I apprehend it not unlikely to have been made by Mani's enemies, and to have been injurious to him in some respects, though there may have been in it some of his genuine sayings and observations.

12. Titus of Bosra intimates that ^c Mani's books, at least the book he answered, was written in Syriac. Augustine however supposeth that ^d they had books written in Persic.

13. From Augustine we learn that the ^e Manichees had many and large books, adorned at great expense. Perhaps the bulk of the volumes was owing to the largeness of the letters in which ^f they were written throughout; such as were otherwise generally used only at the beginnings of books or chapters.

14. I have now finished my account of Mani's works: I wish we

^y See the next section, near the beginning. ^z Ib. p. 796, 797.

^a Ipse enim non ignoras, quam pessimus sit, quamque malignus, quique etiam tanta calliditate adversus fideles et summos viros militat, ut et Petrum coegerit sub una nocte tertio Dominum negare. Secundin. ad August. c. 4.

^b ——— quid si alius dicat illud esse immissum, et falsum, quod ipsi proferunt dicente Domino: Omnis qui reliquerit domum, aut uxorem, aut parentes, aut filios propter regnum caelorum, &c. Aug. contr. Adimant. c. 3, n. 2.

^c Οσα μεν εν ιτερα, γραος δικην μεθολογει και γραφει τη συζητη φωνη χρημενος. Tit. l. i. p. 69, in. ^d Itane Persicis libris me jubes credere, qui Hebraeis me dixisti non credere? Aug. contr. Faust. l. 13, c. 17.

^e ——— conspuuntur [al. conspiciuntur]

tur] tam multi et tam grandes et tam pretiosi codices vestri: et multum dolentur labores antiquariorum, et sacelli miserorum, et panis deceptorum. Contr. Faust. l. 13, c. 6. Incendite omnes illas membranas, elegantisque tecturas decoris pelliculis exquisitas, ut nec res superflua vos oneret. ib. cap. 18. ——— cum te illi sonarent mihi frequenter et multiplicitate voce sola, et libris multis et ingentibus. Confess. l. 3, c. 6, n. 10. Vid. et c. 12.

^f Habeant qui volunt veteres libros, vel in membranis purpureis auro argentoque descriptos, vel initialibus, ut vulgo aiunt, litteris, onera magis exarata, quam codices: dummodo mihi, meisque permittant pauperes habere schedulas, et non tam pulchros codices quam emendatos. Hier. Pr. in Job, T. i. p. 798.

had more of them, or at least The Epistle of the Foundation entire, that we might judge for ourselves. Perhaps it might please the curious if some learned man would publish a collection of all Mani's fragments.

SECT. IV. The sentiments of the Manichees concerning divers points.

I. *Mani was a Christian.* II. *Divers particulars in which the Manichees agreed with other Christians.* III. *Whether Mani was an impostor? The question proposed, and the opinions of several about it.* IV. *Reasons for thinking he was an impostor, with an examination of those reasons.* V. *Additional observations.* VI. *The Manichean sentiments concerning the divine perfections. Whether they believed two gods? They believed God creator, and a trinity. Whether they worshipped the sun?* VII. *They held two eternal principles.* VIII. *Their account of the creation of the world.* IX. *Of the formation of man.* X. *That man has two souls.* XI. *Of the fall of man.* XII. *Of marriage.* XIII. *Of free will.* XIV. *Of fate.* XV. *Of the lawfulness of war.* XVI. *They held the transmigration of souls.* XVII. *They denied the resurrection of the body.* XVIII. *Of the future judgment, and the eternity of hell torments.* XIX. *Of the end of the world.* XX. *The grounds and reasons of their faith in Christ.* XXI. *They believed Christ to be God, but not man.* XXII. *Their opinion of Christ's crucifixion, death, and resurrection.* XXIII. *Whether they thought the death of Christ to be a propitiatory sacrifice?*

I. THE first thing I observe for shewing Mani's sentiments is, that he was a Christian.

Entering into the debate with Archelaus, he is made to say: 'I, brethren, am ^a a disciple and an apostle of Jesus Christ.' His letter to Marcellus, inserted in the work ascribed to Archelaus, is thus inscribed: 'Mani, an ^b apostle of Jesus Christ, and all the saints with me, unto Marcellus my dear son, grace, mercy and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.' In that letter he complains that 'some ^c, even Christians, did not believe the things said in the gospels by our

^a Ego, viri fratres, Christi quidem sum discipulus, apostolus vero Jesu. Arch. n. 43, p. 24, in.

^b Μανιχαῖος ἀποστόλος

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

χαρὶς, εἰρήνη, εὐαγγέλιον ἀπὸ τοῦ

πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. κ. λ. n. 5, p. 6.

^c Οὐτε γὰρ τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ἐν ἐναγγέλοις παρ' αὐτῆς τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ περιγινώσκουσιν. ib. p. 7.

‘Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.’ At the village Diodoris, Mani is represented speaking to Archelaus in this honest, and resolute, and truly Christian manner: ‘If ^d you have a mind to persecute me, I submit: if you would inflict punishments upon me, I do not decline them: if you would kill me, I am not afraid. For we ought to fear him alone, who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell:’ see Matt. x. 28.

Fauftus in his book usually proposeth difficulties and objections against their scheme in the way of question: ‘Do ^e you receive the gospel? Yes certainly.’ Afterwards: ‘Do ^f you receive the gospel; and do you ask me whether I receive the gospel, when in fact it appears that I receive it by doing what it commands?’ which he there proceeds to shew in a variety of particulars. He ^g speaks ‘of the wholesome, or saving words of the Lord, and his divine discourses.’ And, according to him, Christ ^h is light and truth itself, and ⁱ a teacher and model of all virtue.

Fauftus readily professeth himself and the rest of the Manichees ^k to be disciples of Christ and his apostles: nor ^l will they be prevailed upon by any to forsake Jesus, the son of God, their master. Our ^m Lord, and our Saviour, are characters and titles by which they continually speak of Jesus Christ.

Titus of Bosra owns that ⁿ they honoured the name of Christ. Augustine observes, that ^o they would not say the doctrine of the apostles of Christ was in any respect false and mistaken.

By all which we may perceive how much the late ingenious Stephen Nye was mistaken, when he said that ^p the Manichees never were accounted a sect of Christians.

I shall add but little more here.

Fortunatus,

^d Si persequi volueris, paratus sum: et si inferre supplicia, non refugiam. Si etiam interficere me vis, non reformido. &c. Arch. n. 47, p. 84.

^e Accipis evangelium? Et maxime? Fauft. l. 2, c. i.

^f Accipis evangelium? Tu me interrogas, utrum accipiam evangelium, in quo id ipsum accipere apparet, quia quæ jubet observo? Ego patrem dimisi, et interrogas, utrum accipiam evangelium? Nisi adhuc nescis, quid sit quod evangelium nuncupatur. l. 5, c. i.

^g — credimus, — tum præcepta salutaria ejus, tum parabolas, cunctumque sermonem deiſicum. Id. l. 32, c. 7.

^h — Christum lumen, sanctimonium, divina omnia pecentem. l. 14, c. i. f.

— veritatis auctori. l. 16, c. 2.

ⁱ Quid vero et de magistro ipſo dicemus

ac sanctimonii totius auctore Jesu — l. 30, c. 4. ^k — ut fere Christo placet et ejus apostolis, et nobis profecto. l. 24, c. i. med. — neque id temere aut præsumtive, sed a Christo discentes et ejus apostolis, &c. eod. cap. ad fin.

^l Nos vero quamvis de hac sententia nemo prius deſiciat, ex Deo accipiendi filium Dei. l. 23, c. 3, in. ^m Et merito dixisse Dominum nostrum. Fortunat. Disp. i. c. 14. Evafimus igitur, quia spiritalem secuti sumus salvatorem. Nam illius tantum erupit audacia, ut si noster Dominus carnalis foret, omnis nostra fuisset spes amputata. Secundin. ad Aug. c. 4.

ⁿ — ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ τετιμῆται το ὁνομα τοῦ ἰησοῦ, — Tit. l. 3, in. p. 139.

^o Nam illa vox altera Paganorum est, qui dicunt, Apostolos Christi non recta docuisse.

Fortunatus, the Manichæan presbyter, in the dispute with Augustine, says, the ^a soul cannot be reconciled to God but by the Lord Jesus Christ: that ^r Christ our Saviour has taught us what good we ought to do, and what evil we ought to avoid, in order to please God: that ^s the doctrine of Christ is sound doctrine, by which the soul may be purified from it's defilements, and brought back to the kingdom of God.

II. Mani then and his followers were Christians. It will appear farther from great numbers of things to be taken notice of as we go along. However, I would here add a few passages shewing, in some measure, what opinions they held in common with other Christians.

They believed a God and a trinity, and that God made the world; so Augustine ^t says, Nevertheless we may hereafter observe some differences between them and other Christians upon these heads.

They required and encouraged repentance, as Augustine likewise assures ^u us.

And he observes that ^x he and the Manichees agree in saying that we ought to love God and our neighbour. But they denied that this was taught in the Old Testament.

Let me here add the confession of faith made by Fortunatus at the beginning of the dispute with Augustine in the year 392; though some expressions there used are not altogether agreeable to the catholic doctrine.

'Our belief,' says ^y Fortunatus, 'is this, that God is incorruptible, glorious, inaccessible, incomprehensible, impassible, dwelling

F f 4

docuisse. Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 16. in. ^z Nye's Def. of the Canon of the New Test. p. 87, &c. ⁹ — et animam aliter non posse reconciliari Deo, nisi per magistrum, qui est Jesus Christus. Aug. et Fortu. Disp. i. n. 17.

^t — auctore Salvatore nostro, qui nos docet et bona exercere, et mala fugere. Disp. 2, n. 20, f. ^s — si post admonitionem Salvatoris nostri, et sanam doctrinam ejus, a contraria et inimica sui stirpe se segregaverit anima; — Unde patet recte esse poenitentiam datam post adventum Salvatoris, et post hanc scientiam rerum, qua possit anima, ac si divino fonte lota, de lordibus et vitiis tam mundi otius, quam corporum in quibus eadem anima versatur, regno Dei, unde progressa est, repræsentari. Fort. Disp. 2, c. 21.

^u Numquid propterea dicere non debemus, quod bonus Deus fecerit mundum; quia hoc dicit etiam Manichæus? — Item

si interrogemur, utrum sit Deus? et nos et Manichæi respondemus; Est Deus. — De ipsa quoque Trinitate interrogati, utrique dicimus, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum ejusdem esse naturæ. Aug. Op. Imp. l. v. c. 30. ^u Nam ut inter omnes sanos constet, et quod ipsi Manichæi non solum fatentur, sed et præcipiunt, utile est poenitere peccati. Aug. de duab. Anim. c. 14, n. 22, m.

^x Atque in his duobus convenit mihi cum Manichæis id est, ut Deum et proximum diligamus: sed hoc veteri testamento negant contineri. De Mor. Ec. Cath. c. 28, n. 57. ^y Et nostra professio ipsa est, quod incorruptibilis sit Deus, quod lucidus, quod inadibilis, quod intenibilis, impassibilis, æternam lucem et propriam inhabitet: quod nihil ex se se corruptibile proferat, nec tenebras, nec demones, nec Satanam, nec aliquid adversum in regno ejus reperiri possit. Sui autem similem Salvatore

‘dwelling in his own eternal light: that he produceth nothing
 ‘from himself that is corruptible, not darkness, not da-
 ‘mons, not Satan: that he has sent a Saviour like himself, the
 ‘Word, born before the foundation of the world; who, after the
 ‘world was made, came among men to save the souls worthy of
 ‘his holy favour, sanctified by his heavenly precepts, through
 ‘faith and reason endowed with the knowledge of heavenly
 ‘things: and that under his conduct those souls shall again re-
 ‘turn to the kingdom of God, according to his holy promise,
 ‘who said: *I am the way, the truth, and the door: and no man*
 ‘*cometh unto the Father but by me:* John xiv. 6. These things we
 ‘believe, forasmuch as souls cannot otherwise, that is, through
 ‘any other mediator, return to the kingdom of God: for he him-
 ‘self says: *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also:* ver. 9.
 ‘and, *He that believeth on me shall not taste death, but passeth from*
 ‘*death to life, and cometh not into condemnation:* chap. v. 24. These
 ‘things we believe, and this is the ground of our faith; as also,
 ‘that with all the powers of our mind we are to obey his holy
 ‘commandments, holding the doctrine of the trinity, the Father,
 ‘the Son, and the Holy Ghost.’

Thus Fortunatus; who likewise just before had professed his belief and expectation^a of the future judgment of the just judge Jesus Christ: and Secundinus, in his letter to Augustine, reminds^a him of the just tribunal of the Great Judge; and asks him if^b it be not true which Paul says, *that every one must give an account of his works?* Rom. xiv. 12.

III. Before we proceed to a more particular examination of Mani's principles, it may be proper to consider what were his pretensions, or upon what grounds he recommended his peculiar doctrines; whether upon the foot of reason only or of a peculiar revelation.

We have already seen how Eusebius and some other catholic

Salvatorem direxisse, Verbum natum a constitutione mundi, cum mundum fabricaret, post mundi fabricam inter homines venisse, dignas sibi animas elegisse sanctæ suæ voluntati, mandatis suis cœlestibus sanctificatas, fide ac ratione imbutas cœlestium rerum; ipso ductore hinc iterum easdem animas ad regnum Dei reversuras esse, secundum sanctam ipsius pollicitationem, qui dixit: Ego sum via, veritas, et janua; et nemo potest ad Patrem pervenire, nisi per me. His rebus nos credimus, quia alias animæ, id est, alio mediante non poterunt ad regnum Dei reverti, nisi ipsum reperiunt, viam, veritatem et januam. Ipse enim dixit: qui me vidit,

vidit et patrem meum; et, qui in me crediderit, mortem non gustabit in æternum, sed transitum facit de morte ad vitam, et in judicium non venit. His rebus credimus, et hæc est ratio fidei nostræ, et pro viribus animi nostri mandatis ejus obtemperare, unam fidem sectantes hujus trinitatis, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Fortunat. Disp. i. n. 3. ^a —et in futura justii judicis Christi examinatione.—ib. n. 3.

^a Quis igitur tibi patronus erit ante justum tribunal judicis, cum et de sermone et opere ceperis te teste convinci. Secund. ad Aug. n. 3. ^b An falsum in Paulo est, quod operum singuli suorum non erunt reddituri rationem? ib.

writers

p. 178.

writers express themselves. Eusebius in particular says, 'he * made an appearance of being Christ, and sometimes said he was the Comforter, and the Holy Ghost himself; and that like Christ he chose himself twelve apostles.' Epiphanius says that 'he presumed sometimes to say he was the Holy Ghost, and at other times that he was an apostle of Jesus Christ. According to Cyril, Mani ^d said he was the Comforter, and the defender of truth: and in another place that ^e he said he was the Holy Spirit.

In The Acts of Archelaus, at the beginning of the conference at Caschar, he is made to say: 'I, ^f brethren, am a disciple and apostle of Jesus Christ. I am the Comforter, promised to be sent by Jesus, to convince the world of sin, and of righteousness: John xvi. 8. as also Paul sent before me said: *We know in part, and prophecy in part*; 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10; reserving to me that which is perfect, that I might *do away that which is in part*: receive therefore this third testimony by me, and own me as a chosen apostle of Jesus Christ. If you will receive my words, you will obtain salvation: if not, you will be consumed by everlasting fire.'

Theodoret says that ^g Mani gave out he was the Christ, and called himself the Holy Ghost.

And, as Jerom expresseth it, some ^h pretended that Mani was the Comforter himself. And to the like purpose ⁱ Rufinus.

It is not easy to conceive how any man should say all these things of himself; that he is the Christ, and an apostle of Christ, and the Holy Ghost himself. However, to reconcile these accounts, if possible, it may be observed, that perhaps some of these writers use words in a different sense from that in which they are now generally understood by us: and when it is said that Mani pretended to be Christ, the meaning may be that he acted like

* See before, p. 375.

^e Εἶπε δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ μαθητὴς εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ παρακλήτο, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἀποβολὴν φασὶν αὐτοῦ χρίστος, ποτὲ δὲ πνεῦμα παρακλητόν. Epiph. H. 66, n. 12, p. 629, B. Conf. B. 19, p. 635, C. ^d ——— οὕτως λέγων αὐτοῦ παρακλητόν, καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀγνώστην, κ. λ. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 26.

^f Μαθητὴς οὐ αὐτοῦ ἐκπαύοντο τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Cat. 16, n. x. p. 248, D. ^f Ego, viri

fratres, Christi quidem sum discipulus, apostolus vero Jesu. — Sum quidem ego Paracletus, qui ab Jesu mitti prædictus sum, ad arguendum mundum de peccato, et de injustitia, sicut et qui ante me missus est Paulus, ex parte scire, et ex parte prophetare se dixit; mihi reservans quod per-

fectum est, ut hoc quod ex parte est destruam. Tertium ergo testimonium accipite, apostolum me esse Christi electum. Et si vultis mea verba accipere, invenietis salutem; nolentes autem, vos æternus ignis absumere habet. Arch. n. 13, p. 24.

^g ——— ἐτόλμησεν αὐτοῦ ὁ παμπόνητος καὶ χρίστον προσαναγορεύσαι, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ὀνομασαι. Thdr. H. F. l. 1, c. 26, p. 224.

^h Sicut aliæ hæreses Paracletum in Montanum venisse contendunt, et Manichæum ipsum dicunt esse Paracletum. ad Vigilant. T. 4, P. 2, p. 285, in.

ⁱ Consilium namque vanitatis est quod docet Manichæus: primo, quod seipsum Paracletum nominavit. Ruf. in Symb. ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 142.

Christ

Christ in chusing for himself twelve companions; or, by Christ may be meant the Holy Ghost, with whom Christ was anointed, and whom Mani pretended to have received. So the word Christ is used in some ancient^k writings, particularly in ¹ The Acts of Archelaus.

As for his calling himself the Comforter, or the Holy Ghost, and an apostle of Christ, possibly the meaning is, that he said he had received the Holy Ghost, and was an apostle of Christ, eminently furnished with spiritual gifts.

That must be the highest pretension he made. This is Augustine's summary account of the matter in his book Of Heresies. 'They^m say that our Lord's promise of sending the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, has been fulfilled in their master Mani: and in his epistles he styles himself apostle of Jesus Christ, forasmuch as Christ had promised him, and in him had sent the Holy Ghost. Accordingly he had himself twelve disciples, in imitation of the number of the apostles, which number is still kept up by the Manichees.' Again, Augustine says, 'the Manichees pretended that Christ's promise of sending the Holy Ghost had been fulfilled in their leader.' And in another place, 'they said thatⁿ the Holy Ghost, whom the Lord had promised to send to his disciples, had come to them by him.' Once more Augustine says, that 'Mani^p endeavoured to persuade men, that the Holy Ghost did personally dwell in him with full authority.'

That this is all which Mani can be supposed to have pretended to, is evident from the arguments made use of in confuting him. The ancient writers, in their answers, shew that the promise of sending the Holy Ghost had been fulfilled in the apostles soon after our Lord's ascension: whereas Mani did not appear until long after the death of all the apostles, in the time of Probus, or Aurelian. This is largely argued by ^q Archelaus, ^r Epipha-

^k See Beauf. T. i. p. 115, and 255.

^l Hic est Christus Dei, qui descendit super eum, qui ex Maria est. Arch. n. 50, p. 93, in. Vid. ib. n. 34, p. 59, 60.

^m Promissionem domini Jesu Christi de Paraceto Spiritu Sancto in suo hæresiarcha Manichæo dicunt esse completam. Unde se in suis literis Jesu Christi apostolum dicit, eo quod Jesus Christus se missurum esse promiserit, atque in illo miserit Spiritum Sanctum. Propter quod etiam ipse Manichæus discipulos habuit, ad instar apostolici numeri, quem numerum Manichæi hodieque custodiunt. Aug. de Hær. c. 46. ⁿ — Mira cæcitate asserentes eandem Domini promissionem in

suo hæresiarcha Manichæo esse completam. Aug. ad. Ceret. Ep. 237, [al. 253] n. 2.

^o Nosti enim quod auctoris sui Manichæi personam in apostolorum numerum inducere molientes, dicunt Spiritum Sanctum, quem Dominus se missurum esse promisit, per ipsum ad nos venisse. De Util. Cred. c. 3, n. 7.

^p Non enim parvi existimari se voluit, sed spiritum sanctum consolatorem et ditatorem fidelium tuorum, auctoritate plenaria personaliter in se esse persuadere conatus est. Confess. l. 5, cap. 5, n. 8.

^q Vid. Arch. n. 27, 28. ^r Ep. H. 66, n. 20, 21.

p. 183.

nius, and others. And in the dispute itself Mani is represented explaining his claim in this manner, 'that' the Spirit came 'upon him.' And Archelaus argues, that 'the Holy Ghost was to descend upon and dwell in none but Christ, and Paul, and the other apostles; that is, in the most eminent and extraordinary manner.

All therefore that Mani could say is, that he was an apostle of Christ, and had the spirit as an apostle.

But whether he said so much may be questioned. Godfrey ^u Arnold, a learned German, who wrote a history of heresies in his own language, denies that Mani took upon him any extraordinary character: but Beaufobre, though a man of great candour, thinks Arnold was mistaken herein. 'Arnold ^x was in the right to say that Mani never pretended to be the Comforter; but he was in the wrong to deny that he aimed to pass for the prophet of the Comforter; or a man extraordinarily sent to reveal to the Christian church some truths which Jesus Christ had not made known to his disciples. The Manichees themselves had this opinion of their patriarch.' So Beaufobre.

I beg leave to consider this point distinctly. I have not had the advantage of seeing Arnold's work. I can only represent the case as it appears to me.

IV. In the first place I shall mention divers reasons and arguments for thinking that Mani was an impostor, and examine them. After which I shall mention some additional observations.

The reasons and arguments are such as these: 1. The ancient Greek and Roman Christian authors represent his pretensions as very extraordinary; 2. As do likewise the eastern writers. 3. Mani imitated Christ in chusing and sending out twelve apostles. 4. He called himself apostle. 5. Divers other of his expressions shew him to have pretended to a divine commission. 6. His followers conceived of him as an apostle, or an inspired teacher. 7. They rejected the book of the Acts, because of the evidence it afforded, that the promise of sending the Spirit had been fulfilled in the apostles, and therefore could not belong to Mani.

^u Spiritum enim venisse super te dixisti, quem promiserat Jesus esse missurum. Arch. n. 50, p. 92, m. ^t Et sicut non super omnes homines spiritus habitare poterat, nisi super eum qui de Maria natus est, ita et in nullum alium Spiritus Patetis venire poterat, nisi super aposto-

los, et super beatum Paulum. Arch. n. 34, p. 59, m. ^v Germanice illam epistolam [Fundamenti,] exhibet Gothofredus Arnoldus in Historia sive Apologia Hæresium. T. iv. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 283. ^x Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 239, 240.

I. The

1. The ancient Greek and Roman Christian writers represent Mani's pretensions as very extraordinary.

I answer, that we have shewn them to be mistaken in several things. In particular, divers of them say that Mani called himself the Comforter, which is not true. We must therefore look for some other evidence of his imposture beside their word. Mani published several new notions as doctrines of religion: some might therefore say: 'A man that does this had need to be inspired.' And thence some might be led to conclude, that he actually pretended to be inspired in an extraordinary manner, and sent by Christ to reveal new truths. Some might speak of him to this purpose; and others might take up this account without much examination.

2. The eastern writers, whether Persians or Arabians, whose account was formerly ^y taken, speak of him in the like manner.

I answer, that those writers are not very ancient. Their account of Mani's imposture, particularly his journey to heaven, is taken from the history of Mahomet, who is much later than the person whose affairs we are examining. Therefore probably that story is a fiction, without any real foundation. I formerly ^z observed a mistake of these writers (some of them at least) concerning the place of Mani's retirement. It is also very improbable, which is said by the eastern historians, as quoted by Herbelot, that numerous followers having been gained in China, or Turkestan, they all went into Persia upon the death of Sapor. Nor did Mani attempt to pass for a god. Once more, the eastern writers are not agreed about the time in which Mani lived, some ^a placing him much later than others. The testimony of these authors therefore is not to be relied upon.

3. The third argument is, that Mani imitated Christ in choosing and sending out twelve disciples.

In answer to which I would say: supposing that he had twelve disciples, and sent them abroad to propagate his principles, it does not follow that he was an impostor; for we have been informed by ^b Augustine, that this was the ecclesiastical constitution of the Manichæan sect. There were twelve of the elect called masters, and a thirteenth, who was their chief or principal. If this was an institution of Mani himself, and put in practice in his own time, he must have been the principal; and perhaps only by way of an innocent, or at the worst an affected, imitation of the state of things at the first rise of the Christian religion in the time

^y See p. 422.

^z See p. 423.

^a L' auteur du *Tarikh Khozidek* le fait plus modern, &c. See Herbelot *Bib. Orient.* in Mani.

^b See before, p. 403.

of Christ and his apostles: which, I suppose, is all that can be thought of their keeping up the same form in Augustine's time.

But it may be questioned whether Mani had twelve disciples distinguished from the rest. It is true Eusebius intimates as much: but what ground he had for it we cannot say. However, Augustine ^c says it expressly, as does ^d Theodoret, about the year 420. But this is not to be found in more ancient authors, excepting Eusebius only, who has been just named; and there are two reasons to doubt of it. First, several ancient writers are silent about this particular, who would have mentioned it if true. In ^e The Acts of the Dispute with Archelaus there are but three of Mani's disciples named, whom likewise he is there said to have sent abroad to spread his opinions; one into the east, another into Syria, and the third into Egypt; Thomas, Addas, and Hermas: the same three that are mentioned by ^f Cyril and ^g Epiphanius. Secondly, if Mani had twelve disciples, whom he called apostles, or employed as such, it is likely that their names would have been transmitted to us by some ancient authors: but there is no such catalogue any where to be found, except in the forementioned authors, Photius, Peter, and The Form of abjuring Manichæism: all which are too late to be of any authority, as was observed formerly. That catalogue too is itself liable to several exceptions. In ^h Photius their names stand thus: Sisinus, said to have succeeded Mani in his ⁱ chair; Thomas, Budas, Hermas, Adamantus, and Adimantus; Hierax, Hieraclides and Aphonius, called ^k commentators upon Mani; Agapius author of the Heptalogus, Zarvas and Gaurialius: and to the like purpose in the two other ^l writers. But it is plain that this catalogue is of no value. In The Acts of Archelaus, ^m Sisinus is said to have deserted Mani, and to have been a convert to the catholic church. Then there are two or three different names, which are but one and the same person; Budas, Adamantus, and Adimantus; that

^c Propter quod etiam ipse Manichæus duodecim discipulos habuit, ad instar apostolici numeri. Aug. de Hær. c. 46.

^d Ουτος δυοκαιδεκα μαθητας κατα τον κρηκου ποιησαμενος τυπον. Hær. Fab. l. i. p. 214, C.

^e Ταυτην δε πασαν την διδασκαλιαν παρεδωκε τοις τρισιν αυτην μαθηταις, κληενσας εκατον εις κλιματα οδινειν. κ. λ. Arch. c. xi. p. 22. Acquisivit etiam discipulos tres, quorum nomina sunt hæc, Thomas, Addas et Hermas. ib. c. 53, p. 98.

^f Ταυτη μαθηταις τρεις γιγοισι, Θωμας, και βαδδας, και ερμας. Cyr. Cat. vi. p. 31.

^g Epiph. H. 66, n. v. et xii.

^h Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. n. 14.

ⁱ Σισινιος, ο και το αξιωμα αυτου της δυσ-

σινης διδασκαλιας αναδιξαμενος. ib.

^k εξηρηται, δε αυτη και οιοι υπομνηματιται. ib.

^l Porro discipuli Maneti antichristo fuere duodecim: Sisinus, qui Maneti successit: Thomas, qui Evangelium Manichæi novum condidit: Buddas, et Hermas, Adamantus et Adimantus, quem in diversas orbis partes erroris præconem amandavit. Manetis interpretes et explanatores erant Hierax, et Hieraclides, atque Aphonius. Adjuncti his et alii terni hujus sectatores, Agapius, qui Heptalogum commentus est, Zarvas et Gabri-
al. Pet. Sic. de Man. ap. Bib. P. P. T. 16, p. 758, A.

^m Arch. n. 51, p. 94.

is, Addas, otherwise called also Buddas and Baddas. Athonius lived in the fourth century, as was ⁿ formerly shewn. Hierax was no ^o Manichee. Toutée has a good note upon Cyril relating to this matter, which might be consulted. I put down a small part of ^p it.

4. The fourth argument is that Mani called himself an apostle of Jesus Christ. Augustine assures us that ^q all his letters began in that manner; particularly, that ^r called The Epistle of the Foundation: 'Mani, apostle of Jesus Christ by the providence of God the Father:' in like manner ^s The Epistle to Marcellus, in The Acts of Archelaus; and The ^t Epistle to Menoch, cited by Julian the Pelagian.

Answer: if this title must be here understood in the highest and strongest sense, of a person commissioned by Christ, and inspired as an apostle, the argument is complete and unanswerable. But possibly Mani meant no more than a disciple of Christ, and a teacher of his religion. This may be argued from the passage already cited from Augustine, where he speaks of the ecclesiastical constitution of the sect. The word may be supposed to be so used in The Dispute of Archelaus. That bishop having given hard words, Mani tells him that ^u apostles are patient and long-suffering: thereby, perhaps, intending to shew what Archelaus should be, as well as what he himself was, according to his own profession. Turbo, when asked who he was, answered, that ^x he came from Persia, and was sent by Mani, a master of the Christians; the very title, which, as Augustine informs us, was ^y given to twelve of the Manichæan elect in his own time, who yet, I presume, were not reckoned inspired apostles: and masters is a word made use of in ^z The Acts of Archelaus to denote ministers of the catholic church. I might add that the eastern people are very

ⁿ See p. 396. ^o See before, p. 399, &c. ^p Quod quamvis antiqua sit illa de duodecim Manetis discipulis opinio, ab augustino in libro de Hæresibus, et Theodoro commemorata, non tamen apud antiquiores legatur. Non id refert Archelaus, non Epiphanius. In Cyril. Cat. p. 107. ^q Omnes tamen ejus epistolæ sic exordiantur: Manichæus apostolus Jesu Christi. Contr. Faust. l. 13, c. 4.

^r Certe sic incipit: Manichæus apostolus Jesu Christi, providentia Dei Patris. Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 5, n. 6.

^s Arch. cap. v. ^t Manes apostolus Jesu Christi filiae Menoch. ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 172. Sed nisi Menoch filiam, et Manichæum, qui se Christi apostolum

nominat, titulus indicaret, te omnino suum pollicerentur auctorem. Julian. ib. c. 187. ^u Tu quoque, Archelae, bene me de Deo sentientem, dignamque opinionem de Christo retinentem, verbis molestissimis obtundis, licet tale sit apostolorum genus, patiens et ferens omnia, etiam si eos convitiis quis, aut maledictis obtrectet. Arch. c. 47, in.

^x De Perside autem venio, a Manichæo magistro Christianorum missus. ib. c. 4. ^y Nam ex electis suis habent duodecim, quos appellant magistros. Aug. de Hær. c. 46.

^z Cui enim oportet credi? magistris illis vestris, qui carnibus vescuntur, et affluentissimis deliciis perfruuntur—? Manes ap. Arch. c. 13, p. 24.

p. 192.

apt to use a lofty style. They give and take high titles without incurring the suspicion or charge of blasphemy.

5. It is argued that Mani's imposture may be proved by other high expressions made use of by him beside that of apostle. In The Epistle to Marcellus he not only styles himself apostle of Jesus Christ, but says also that ^a he was sent for the amendment and reformation of men. Several passages have been already cited ^b from The Dispute of Archelaus, containing high pretensions, which should be recollected here; particularly that passage where he says: 'If you receive my words, you will obtain salvation: if not, you will be consumed with everlasting fire.' But then it should be remembered likewise, that in that piece are many misrepresentations of things.

There are also strong expressions at the beginning of The Epistle of the Foundation. After having called himself apostle he adds: 'That ^c the words he is going to deliver are wholesome words, proceeding from the living fountain. He that hears and believes and keeps them shall never die, but shall obtain a glorious and eternal life.' These expressions ought to be considered. If they relate to any doctrines not founded on scripture, they contain a bold claim: but if he intends to recommend only scriptural doctrines, the interpretation may be softened. And it is observable that Augustine, having cited those words, does not, in his remarks upon them, censure them as wicked, or antichristian, or the like; but only says that ^d here is indeed a promise of teaching the truth, but without good assurance: and that any body might say as much to draw in simple people. Augustine then cites the words next following in that epistle: 'The ^e peace of the invisible God, and the knowledge of the truth, be with the dear and holy brethren, who both believe and keep the heavenly commands:' which Augustine does not blame at all, but says he readily joins in the same wish: and if Mani never spoke otherwise he might be read and followed by every body. Nay, he

^a Οθεν προς επανορθωσιν τη των ανθρωπων γυναικες αποσταλεις. Ap. Arch. c. 5.

^b See before. p. 441.

^c Hæc sunt, inquit, salubria verba ex perenni ac vivo fonte, quæ qui audierit, et eisdem primum crediderit, deinde quæ insinuant custodierit, numquam erit morti obnoxius, verum æterna et gloriosa vita fruatur. ap. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich. c. xi. n. 12. ^d Et hæc, ut videtis, pollicitatio est, nondum exhibitio veritatis: et vos quoque animadvertere facillime potestis, isto velamine quolibet errores

fucari posse, ut imperitorum animis per ornatum januam latenter irrepant. August. ibid.

^e Pax, inquit, Dei invisibilis, et veritatis notitia sit cum fratribus sanctis et carissimis, qui mandatis cœlestibus credunt pariter atque deservunt. Ita sit, ut dicit. Nam et ista benigna et acceptissima optatio est. Tantum meminerimus hæc et a bonis doctoribus et a deceptoribus dici posse. Itaque si nulla nisi talia diceret, omnibus legendum et amplectendum esse concederem. ibid. n. 13.

seems

apt

seems to declare himself well satisfied ^f with every thing at the beginning of that epistle.

6. Still it is urged that his followers conceived of him as an inspired apostle and messenger of Christ, and honoured him accordingly. Some of their expressions have been mentioned already, to which others may be now added.

Faustus, considering that text, Matt. v. 17: *I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil*, says: 'He ^g must be for ever thankful to his 'master,' meaning Mani, 'for helping him here: for otherwise, 'he had been a Jew, not a Christian.' However, he might speak thus of Mani, though he considered him only as a good interpreter, and no inspired prophet or apostle. In another place Mani is called ^h their divine. What can be inferred from this I do not know; I do not perceive any uncommon honour to be here given. Faustus also calls Mani ⁱ their blessed father. But perhaps no more is meant thereby than what the catholics often said of saints and martyrs. Faustus in another place speaks ^k as if by the Spirit, whom they had received, they were enabled to discern what texts of the New Testament are genuine, what not. But afterwards ^l he retracts in some measure those bold expressions.

Farther, the Manichees celebrated the day of their master's death: but so did the catholics that of many martyrs. Mani's Epistle of the Foundation was read in the assemblies of his followers: and so likewise were some writings publicly read among the catholics, which they never esteemed canonical scripture, or a part of the rule of their faith. Nay, I do not know but here may offer a thought, which may afford a good argument that the Manichees did not esteem their leader an apostle: for if they had so done they would have had more of his writings, and have publicly read them: whereas it seems that the Manichees in Africa had few of them. Augustine, who was nine years among them, and afterwards wrote many volumes in the controversy, has quoted very few, and does not speak of any other book, or letter of his, being read in their assemblies, but the epistle above-named.

And upon all these things, beside what has been already hinted, I observe in general, that some, or all of these honours were paid by catholics to men who had not the character of apostles:

^f Et omnino, quicquid in hujus epistolæ initio scriptum est, donec veniatur ad causam, nolo reprehendere. *ibid.*

^g Quare indeficientes ego præceptori meo refero gratias, qui me similiter labentem retinuit, ut essem hodie Christianus. *Faust. l. 19, c. 5.* ^h Sic enim mali principium ac naturam theologus noster ap-

pellat. *Faust. l. 20, c. 3.*

ⁱ — a doctissimo scilicet, et solo nobis post beatum patrem nostrum Manichæum stupendo Adimanto. *Faust. l. i. c. 2.*

^k Et nobis Paracletus ex novo testamento promissus perinde docet, quid accipere ex eodem debeamus, et quid repudiare. *Id. l. 32, c. 6.* ^l *ib. c. 7.*

p. 197.

that it is no uncommon thing for honours to be given to men after their death, by some people, which they never expected or desired; and that we should interpret expressions as they are intended to be understood. The catholic Christians often speak ^m of men's receiving the Holy Ghost in baptism. In The Dispute of Archelaus it is spoken of as an incontestable thing that ⁿ the Spirit was still given to men. And Epiphanius says that ^o God, according to his promise, bestowed gifts of the Spirit largely upon the presbyter at Diodoris, to enable him to confute Mani: quoting also Matt. x. 19. But yet no one thinks that apostolical inspiration is here intended.

7. In the seventh place it is argued that they rejected the Acts of the apostles, because of the evidence it afforded, that the promise of sending the Spirit had been fulfilled in the apostles of Christ, and therefore could not belong to Mani. Augustine ^p says as much.

I answer, first, whether the Manichees always and universally rejected the book of the Acts will be distinctly considered hereafter. Secondly, they were not obliged to reject the Acts for the reason here supposed. They might give the highest character to Mani, under Christ, and yet receive that book. The Montanists, as ^q Augustine observes, spoke of Montanus, as these people did of Mani: yet ^{*} they readily received the Acts of the apostles. The Manichees could not deny that the Holy Ghost was poured out upon Christ's apostles. It is evident from St. Paul's epistles, which they received. Besides, we know, that ^r they acknowledged

^a Καὶ γὰρ οὐ θείας ἀπληθύνουσας χάριτος ἐπιτιθεμένων, καὶ πνεύματος μετισχυῆς, ἡ καὶ πρὸς τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖται. Chrys. De Compunct. ad Rom. l. i. T. i. p. 136. D. Ed. Bened.

ⁿ Spiritus enim secundum rectam rationem habitat in homine, et descendit, et permanet, et competenter hoc et factum est, et fit semper, sicut tu testis ante hoc tempus profitebaris esse Paracletum Dei. Arch. c. 50, p. 92, m.

^o Οὗτος γὰρ αἰν τοῖς ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐλπίσαντι μακάριος, ὡς καὶ ἐπηγγελάτο, ἀψευδὲς. H. 66. n. xi. ^p Nosti autem, quod auctoris sui Manichæi personam in apostolorum numerum inducere molientes, dicunt spiritum Sanctum, quem Dominus discipulis se missurum esse promisit per ipsum ad nos venisse. Itaque si illos Actus Apostolorum acciperent, in quibus ad ventus Sancti Spiritus prædicatur, non invenirent, quomodo id immisum esse dicerent. De Unit. Cred. c. 2. n. 7. ^q Nam qui-

dam Manichæi canonicum librum, cuius titulus est, Actus Apostolorum, repudiant. Timent enim evidentissimam veritatem, ubi apparet Sanctus Spiritus missus, quæ est a Domino Jesu Christo in evangelica veritate promissus. Sub ejus quippe Spiritus nomine, a quo penitus alieni sunt, indocta hominum corda decipiunt, mira cæcitate asserentes eandem Domini promissionem in suo hæresiarcha Manichæo esse completam. Quod et illi hæretici faciunt, qui vocantur Cataphryges, dicentes, per nescio quos insanos, Montanum scilicet et Priscillam, quos et proprios suos prophetas habent, venisse Spiritum Sanctum, quem Dominus missurum se esse promisit. Aug. Ep. 237, [al. 253], n. 2.

^{*} See Tertullian in this work, V. ii. p. 261, 262.

^r Et nos de Testamento novo sola accipientes ea, quæ in honorem et laudem Filii majestatis vel ab ipso dicta comperimus, vel ab ejus apostolis, sed jam perfectis et fidelibus. Faust. l. 32. c. 7.

the divine illumination of the apostles, and admitted their authority in every thing said by them, when so illuminated. 'This,' says 'Faustus,' 'is the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, and for 'certain ours likewise.' Again, says Faustus, 'This 'we believe 'not without ground, but upon the authority of Christ and his 'apostles, who first taught this doctrine.' They did not deny that the Holy Ghost was given to the apostles: all that they could be led to say is, that some farther discoveries were made by Mani. But I dispute their saying so much as that. Thirdly, they might have other reasons for rejecting the Acts, different from that assigned by Augustine. According to their notions, they could not approve of the death of Ananias and Sapphira, nor the blindness of Elymas. They could not like any text where Jesus is called a man, as Acts ii. 22. And they disliked all references therein to the books of the Old Testament. Finally, they never told Augustine that they rejected the Acts for the reason mentioned by him. It does not appear that he had any hint of it from them; but it is a conjectural reason of his own invention, after he had left them, as is evident^a from what precedes the passage above * quoted: and therefore he entreats Honoratus candidly to weigh and examine the reason proposed by him, and judge whether it is not right. For he says he had often wondered at their conduct in rejecting that book, without being able to find out what ground they went upon in so doing.

V. I have now considered the most material reasons and arguments for thinking that Mani was an impostor, and pretended to apostolical inspiration. I beg leave to add some farther observations.

1. It is not a pleasing thing, unless there be very cogent reasons, to fix the charge of imposture on a Christian, and a man of great knowledge and understanding, as Mani was. All must be sensible that he is treated roughly enough in The Acts of Archelaus. Yet even there he is sometimes represented speaking honestly, and like a good Christian, and with a due regard to the authority of Jesus Christ. Moreover, we suppose that he suffered a violent death, which was commemorated by his followers in a solemn manner: and there is reason to believe that the occasion of it

^a — ut fere Christo placet, et ejus apostolis, et nobis profecto. — Faust. l. 24. c. 1.

^b Neque id temere aut præsumptive, sed a Christo discentes et ejus apostolis, qui primi eadem in mundo docuisse probantur. Id. l. 24. c. i. fin.

^c Hoc enim de illo libro fecerunt, qui Actus Apostolorum inscribitur. Quod

eorum consilium, cum mecum ipse pertracto, nequeo satis mirari. — Sed nimirum illud est quod mihi videtur, quod peto placidissimo et serenissimo judicio mecum consideres. Nosti enim quod auctoritas sui, &c. De Util. Cred. c. 2, n. 7.

* See note P.

r autho-
' This,'
and for
believe
and his
ot deny
ey could
y Mani.
y might
that as-
ey could
e blind-
Jesus is
ferences
ey never
ention-
it from
after he
passage
didly to
ge whe-
at their
ind out

and ar-
etended
ther ob-

ent rea-
man of
t be sen-
chelaus.
onestly,
authority
d a vio-
in a so-
ion of it

ipse per-
— Sed ni-
etur, quod
adicio me-
d auctoria
7.

was

was innocent, if not honourable. If he attempted to cure the king's son and did not succeed, no reasonable person can think he failed designedly. But there is a great deal of reason to suppose that all that story is fictitious. It is more probable that he died a martyr to some principles, philosophical or religious, or both.

2. The accounts of his pretension to inspiration are not easily reconciled with other accounts, given by the same writers, of his borrowing his peculiar principles from other men; from Scythian, and Terebinthus, and Pythagoras, and Empedocles, and I know not how many more. Eusebius, and others, say his system was patched up out of ancient heresies. Archelaus, or whoever composed the Dispute under his name, particularly desires the by-standers and hearers to take notice that ^y the doctrine taught by Mani was not his own invention. Cyril says that ^z he collected every thing bad in former heresies; and for that reason he calls him a ^a thief, appropriating to himself what were other men's things, though they were very bad. Augustine expressly affirms that, ^b in the doctrine about two principles and natures, Mani followed more ancient heretics. The ancients therefore were sensible that Mani's doctrine was not new. Learned moderns are of the same opinion, and allow that in the main his principles had been taught before by divers heathen philosophers and Christian sects. Mr. Wolff of Hamburgh wrote a learned work, entitled ^c *Manichæism* before Mani, where this is largely shewn. And Beausobre likewise ^d deserves to be consulted upon this point.

3. Though Mani, at the beginning of his epistles, called himself apostle of Christ, we do not plainly perceive, from any remaining fragments of his works, that he professed to teach in the name of Christ, and by special authority under him, or to deliver dictates of the Holy Ghost.

4. If Augustine had found such expressions in any of Mani's works, which he met with, where he pretends to speak by inspiration, it is likely that he would not have insisted so much as he does upon ^e that single appellation of apostle of Christ. Moreover, Augustine having cited a part of The Epistle of the Foundation,

^y Addidit etiam hoc Archelaus dicens, Viri fratres, ne quis vestrum incredulus sit his, quæ a me dicta sunt, id est, quod non ipse primus auctor scelerati hujus dogmatis extiterit Manes; sed tantum, quod per ipsum aliquibus terræ partibus manifestatum sit. Arch. n. 55. p. 100.

^z — δυσσεβιστατος μανης, ο τα των αιρετων πασεων κακα συνειληφως — τα παντα συλλεξας ομη των αιρετικων. Cat. 16. n. 9. p. 247 D.

αλλοτριων κακων, εξιδιοποιηματος τα κακα. id. Cat. 6, n. 21, p. 100.

^b Ille duo principia inter se diversa, — duasque naturas atque substantias, — sequens alios hæreticos, opinatus est. De Hær. c. 46, in.

^c Manichæismus ante Manichæos, et in Christianismo redivivus. Hamb. 1707.

^d See him T. i. p. 29 — 41.

^e Vid. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich. cap. vi. vii. viii.

where Mani delivers some of his notions about two principles, he adds: 'How^f will he prove these things to me? how came he to 'know them himself?' If Mani had any where declared that these things had been communicated to him by special revelation, Augustine would have taken notice of it here. Nay, it seems to me that^g from the following words of Augustine it may be strongly argued, and even concluded, that Mani did not make use of such expressions, to recommend his uncertain disputed doctrines, or to assure the truth of them, and that it was not his manner of teaching.

5. The leading principles of Mani's scheme, wherein he differed from other Christians, are of a philosophical nature. Such principles may be recommended without pretending to inspiration. Felix, in the dispute with Augustine, boasts that 'Mani^h had taught them the beginning, middle, and end; who made 'the world, why, and out of what; the course of the sun and 'moon, and other things.' Augustineⁱ answers, that Christ promised to send the Spirit, to teach us all truth, meaning religious truth: not to make us mathematicians and philosophers, but Christians.

6. Mani and his followers were great reasoners. So he is represented in many places^k of The Acts of Archelaus. Such an one was Faustus: he openly professeth that^l the doctrine of Mani taught him not to receive every thing recommended, as said by our Saviour, but first to examine and consider whether it be true, sound, right, genuine: whilst the catholics, he says, swallowed every thing, and acted as if they despised the benefit of human

^f Hæc mihi unde probaturus est, aut hæc ipse unde cognovit? ib. c. 13. n. 17.

^g Et quoniam quæsi unde ipse probet, nunc quæro unde ipse cognoverit? Si dicit sibi esse revelatum a Spiritu Sancto, suamque mentem divinitus illustratam, ut ea quæ dicit, certa et manifesta cognosceret; ipse significat, quid intersit inter cognoscere et credere.—Debuit ergo non nobis polliceri scientiam, neque manifestam cognitionem;—sed dicere potius sibi ista esse monstrata, illos autem quibus narratur credere sibi debere quæ nesciunt. ib. n. 18.

^h Et quia venit Manichæus, et per suam prædicationem docuit nos initium, medium et finem: docuit nos de fabrica mundi, quare facta est, et unde facta est, et qui fecerunt: docuit nos, quare dies, et quare nox: docuit nos de cursu solis et lunæ. Aët. cum. Fel. l. i. c. 9.

ⁱ Non legitur in Evangelio Dominum dixisse, Mitto vobis Paracletum, qui vos

doceat de cursu solis et lunæ. Christianos enim facere volebat, non mathematicos. Aug. ib. c. 10.

^k Pro nimia autem humanitate Marcelli adesse festinavi, ut qualiter observare modum divinæ religionis eum edoceam: ne sicut muta animalia, quæ intellectu carent, nec quid agunt advertunt, ita etiam Marcellus, — ap. Arch. n. 13, p. 24. Vid. ib. p. 7, 8, 25, et passim.

^l Et tamen me quidem adversus capituli hujus necessitudinem Manichæa fides reddidit tutum, quæ principio mihi non cunctis quæ ex Salvatoris nomine scripta leguntur passim credere persuasit, sed probare, si sint eadem vera, si sana, si incorrupta.—Tu vero qui temere credis, qui naturæ beneficium rationem ex hominibus damnas, cui inter verum falsumque iudicare religio est, cuique bonum a contrario separare, non minus formidini est, quam infantibus manix, &c. Faust. l. 18, c. 3.

reason,

reason, and were afraid to examine and distinguish between truth and falsehood. He insinuates elsewhere that ^m the catholics esteemed that a faith not worth naming, which depended upon reasons. The Christian religion, they said, is a plain and simple thing, and curious inquiries are needless and insignificant. I put in the margin ⁿ another like reflection of his. They were not pretensions to inspiration, but specious and alluring promises of rational discoveries, by which Augustine was deluded, as he ^o particularly says in his letter to his friend Honoratus. His words are strong and remarkable; and therefore I transcribe them largely at the bottom of the page. Augustine almost continually represents this as the characteristic of the sect, and the main pretence by which they seduced ^p men. They ^q ridiculed the frightful authority of the church: they ^r bantered the catholic credulity, and ^s promised men science and demonstration. Upon this ^t point turns Augustine's book to his friend Honoratus, still a Manichee, which also is entitled *Of the Usefulness of believing*. In another place Augustine complains of them, that they ^u set up reason above authority or scripture.

7. Mani made no pretensions to miraculous powers: this is

^m Sed tamen hoc enervis fidei confessio est, in Christum sine teste et argumento non credere. Nempe ipsi vos docere solent, idcirco nihil esse curiosius exquirendum, quia simplex sit et absoluta Christiana credulitas. Id. l. 12, c. i. in.

ⁿ At, inquis, beatiores appellat, qui non viderunt et crediderunt. Hoc si ideo dictum putas, ut sine ratione et judicio quidque credamus; esto tu beator sine sensu, ego mihi contentus ero cum ratione beatus audisse. Id. l. 16, c. 8. fin.

^o Nosti enim, Honorate, non aliam ob causam nos in tales homines incidisse, nisi quod se dicebant terribili auctoritate separata, mera et simplici ratione eos qui se audire vellent introducturos in Deum, et errore omni liberaturos. Quid enim me aliud cogebat, annos fere novem, sprete religione quæ mihi puerulo a parentibus insita erat, homines illos sequi ac diligenter audire, nisi quod nos superstitione teneri, et fidem nobis ante rationem imperari dicerent, se autem nullum premere ad fidem, nisi prius discussa et enodata veritate?—Tu,—qua quæso, alia re delectatus es, recordare obsecro te, nisi magna quadam presumptione ac pollicitatione rationum? De Util. Cred. c. i. n. 2.

^p Nonnulli autem heretici, quia non decipiunt, nisi cum scientiam, quam non exhibent, pollicentur. De Diversis Quæst. 83. Qu. 68, n. 1. T. 6.

^q See just be-

fore, note ^o.

^r Est igitur mihi propositum, ut probem tibi, si possim, quod Manichæi sacrilege ac temere invehantur in eos, qui catholicæ fidei auctoritatem sequentes, ante quam illud verum quod pura mente conspicitur intueri queant, credendo præmuniuntur. De Ut. Cred. n. 2. in. vid. et not. ^o. Vos enim nostis, temere credentibus quam vehementer insultare soleatis. Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 13, n. 17.

^s Quid infelicius ista superstitione inveniri potest, quæ non modo non exhibet scientiam quam promittit et veritatem, sed ea dicit quæ vehementer sunt scientiæ veritatisque contraria? Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 15, n. 19.

^t Jam vero — scripsi librum de utilitate credendi, ad amicum meum, quem deceptum a Manichæis, adhuc eo errore noveram detineri, et irridere in catholicæ fidei disciplina quod juberentur homines credere, non autem quid esset verum certissima ratione docerentur. Retr. l. i. c. 14.

^u Unde igitur exordiar? ab auctoritate, an a ratione? Naturæ quidem ordo ita se habet, ut cum aliquid discimus, rationem præcedat auctoritas. — Sed quoniam cum iis nobis res est, qui omnia contra ordinem et sentiunt, et loquuntur, et gerunt, nihilque aliud maxime dicunt, nisi rationem prius esse reddendam, morem illis geram. De Mor. E. C. c. 2. n. 3.

particularly insisted upon in * The Acts of Archelaus. If it should be here said, that his attempt to cure the king of Persia's son was pretending to do a miracle, I might answer, that story is not credibly related. But, setting aside that consideration for the present, I think that what is said in the forementioned Acts, about his doing no miracles, ought to induce us to suppose Mani did not pretend to a miraculous cure. Nor do the Acts, in the relation of that attempt, say so: but that he ^y took upon him to cure the king's son, and killed him: which leads us to think he made use of some external means that proved hurtful. Epiphanius says he ^z had recourse to medicines, but his hopes of cure failed him: Cyril, that ^a he promised to cure the young prince by prayer. Nor was it, I think, unbecoming a pious man, and a teacher of religion, if called in upon occasion of sickness, to make use of prayer. However, it must be owned that ^b Cyril likewise speaks of Mani's killing the king's son; which, as already observed, seems to imply some external applications that were prejudicial; provided there is any foundation at all for this story.

8. I do not recollect that Mani or his followers were ever famous for visions and revelations, as some others have been. It is indeed said, in The Acts of Archelaus, that ^c Mani was admonished in a dream of the king's design to put him to death. But surely every one perceives that to be ridiculous. Does a man, imprisoned by order of his prince, need a revelation to let him know he had best escape if he can? It may also, perhaps, be worth while to observe here, that Mani's deliverance is not ascribed to magic, or any such like thing, but to ^d a large sum of money, by which he bribed his keepers. As for the journey to heaven, mentioned by some eastern writers, I suppose that no one can think it worthy of any regard. In a word, the Manichees, as it seems, were rather a sect of reasoners and philosophers, than visionaries and enthusiasts.

It is observable, that Gregory Nazianzen, mentioning altoge-

* Et post ista omnia mandata, iste nec signum quidem aliquod, aut prodigium ullum ostendens. Arch. c. 35, p. 61. f. Et hæc quidem non inexplorata proloquor; sed ex eo quod nullum te video facere virtutem, ita de te sentio. &c. ib. c. 36, p. 63. ^y — præsentiam suam Manes exhibet apud regem, dicens se esse puerum curaturum. — Verum ne multa narrando quæ gessit, tædium auditoribus inferam, mortuus est puer in manibus ejus, vel potius extinctus. ib. c. 53, p. 98.

^z — τινὰ εἶδη φαρμακευτικῆς προσην-
κας τῷ νοσηλευμένῳ παιδὶ τῇ βασιλεῖ. H.
66, n. 4. ^a ἀλλ' ὁ μανὴς ἐπηγγέλτο διὰ
προσευχῆς ὥσπερ εὐσεβὲς κατορθώσειν. Cat.
6, n. 25. ^b — τῷ παιδὶ τοῦ βασι-
λέως. Ib. n. 26. ^c Quod cum rex Persarum
cognovisset, dignis eum suppliciis subdere
parat. Quo Manes agnito, admonitus in
somnia, elapsus de carcere, in fugam ver-
sus est, auro plurimo custodibus corruptis.
Arch. c. 54, p. 99. ^d See the preced-
ing note c.

ther the^e Montanists, Manichees, Novatians and Sabellians, distinguishes the first by their pretence of inspiration, without imputing any such thing to any of the rest. And in like manner in another^f place, where, beside the forenamed, are also mentioned Valentinus, Marcion, and some others.

Not that the Manichees were silent about the Spirit. No, for certain they, as well as other Christians, claimed an interest in the promise of the Spirit made by Christ: but, whereas Augustine says they^g pretended that the Spirit came to us by Mani, I am not fully satisfied about the justness of his expression. One might be rather apt to conclude from^h words of Faustus, and even from those words of Augustine just cited, *came to us*, that they considered the gift of the Spirit as a blessing common to believers under the gospel dispensation.

If they had gone upon the ground of a particular inspiration in Mani, it might be expected that the traces of that high notion concerning their master should appear more distinctly than they do, in the discourses of the Manichees, with whom Augustine disputed. Fortunatus seems to use strong expressions to the contrary, when he says: 'Heⁱ knows that he cannot by any means shew his faith to be right, unless he proves it by the authority of the scriptures.'

Upon the whole, I do not chuse to deny that Mani was an impostor; but I do not discern evident proofs of it. I plainly see that he was an arrogant philosopher, and a great schemist: but whether he was an impostor, I cannot certainly say. He was abundantly too fond of philosophical notions, which he endeavoured to bring into religion: for this he is to be blamed. But every bold dogmatizer is not an impostor.

I put down Beaufobre's judgment upon this point, when I entered upon the consideration of this question. I must here take notice of several other of his places, where he delivers his opinion concerning this matter. I do it for the sake of my readers, as well as myself, that none, who are desirous of information and judging rightly, may be destitute of any helps that can be obtained for these purposes.

^e Μοντανοὶ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὴ μαρτυροῦντες, κ. λ. Greg. Or. 23, p. 414, C.

^f Μοντανοὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ὑποκρίνοντες· Μαριανὴ τὴν ὑλὴν μετὰ τὴ σκοτεινὴ· Ναννατὴ τὴν ἀλαζονίαν, κ. λ. Or. 25, p. 441, B.

^g —dicunt Spiritum Sanctum, quem Dominus discipulis se missurum esse promisit, per ipsum [Manichæum,] ad nos venisse. De Util. Cred. c. 3, n. 7.

^h —et nobis Paracletus

ex Novo Testamento promissus perinde docet—de quo ultro Jesus, cum eum promitteret, dicit in Evangelio, Ipse vos inducet in omnem veritatem, et ipse vobis annuntiabit omnia, et commemorabit omnia. Faust. ap. Aug. l. 32, cap. 6.

ⁱ Et quia nullo genere recte me credere ostendere possum, nisi eandem fidem scripturarum auctoritate firmaverim. Disp. Fortun. l. 2, n. 20.

He says, in the preface to his work, that ‘Mani^k took the character of an apostle of Christ, and a prophet immediately inspired by the Paraclete, to reveal to the world truths, in which our Lord thought not proper to instruct his first disciples. This was his imposture or fanaticism. For whatever the ancients may say, there are no evident proofs that he ever endeavoured to pass for the Paraclete, or the Spirit.’ He elsewhere speaks of Mani’s pretending^l to a divine vocation. However, he likewise expresseth himself after this manner, speaking at the same time both of Mani, and some others called heretics: ‘In^m what then consisted their error? These heretics were philosophers, who, having formed certain systems, accommodated revelation to them; which was the servant of their reason, not the mistress. Mani, in particular, boasted of having a perfect knowledge of all things, of having banished mysteries, and given a true account of every thing; which the Manichees called the knowledge of the beginning, middle and end of all things. St. Augustine confesseth, that what seduced him in his youth was the hope of understanding every thing by demonstration, and of knowing God by the sole light of reason, without the help of faith.’ Again, says the same learned author: ‘Asⁿ for his heresy in general, it was, properly speaking, a philosophical system, the grounds of which he found in the philosophy of the magi, and which he accommodated, as well as he could, to the revelation of Jesus Christ. Herein he did nothing but what had been done before by many Greeks, and both Greeks and Latins have been doing almost ever since. In all times have been seen philosophers, whose minds were filled with the ideas and notions of Plato and Aristotle; which, under slight pretexts, they have mingled with Christian truths, and erected into articles of faith.’

So Beaufobre°. I readily assent to him in what he says of the philosophical nature of Mani’s system. Whether he pretended to divine inspiration, I cannot say. However, I leave every one to judge as he sees good. But I own I had rather vindicate a Christian from the charge of imposture, than pronounce him guilty, unless the evidence against him be clear and full.

We now proceed to a more distinct examination of the Manichean principles.

VI. Mani had honourable sentiments of the Deity, as self-existent, eternal, completely happy, and perfect in goodness. So

^k T. i. Pr. p. x. xi.

^l T. i. p. 179, 180.

^m B. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 94.

ⁿ Ib. p. 179.

• See him also, T. i. p. 426, note 4, and T. 2, p. 253.

much is evident from the passage of Fortunatus above quoted, and from a passage of Mani himself, to be taken notice of presently.

They owned God to be Almighty: both ^p Fortunatus and ^a Faustus ascribe to God that attribute. Indeed they did not believe this world of ours to be made out of nothing. However, perhaps that was not from a supposition of the want of such power in God, but because they imagined ^r things would have been better than they are, perfectly good, without any mixture of evil, if the matter of which they consisted had been of divine original.

But Mani and his followers did not believe the divine immensity, or ^s that, as to his nature, he was in all places. For part of space, according to them, was occupied by Hyle, the evil principle, matter. But though they limited the divine essence in point of space, they did not limit God in point ^t of power and knowledge. This appears from Augustine, who owns the ^u Manichees taught that God had prepared an eternal prison for the nation of darkness. Therefore God's dominion must be over all.

Upon account of their doctrine of two principles, to be taken notice of hereafter, the Manichees are often charged with believing two gods. So Turbo, in The Acts of Archelaus, expressly says of Mani: 'He ^x worships two gods, self-existent, eternal, 'opposite to each other, one good, the other bad.' And Socrates said, that ^y Mani taught his disciples to worship many gods.

Faustus particularly considers this point. 'Is ^z there one God; 'or are there two gods? For certain, one. Why then do you 'say there are two gods? That is no doctrine of ours. Why do 'you suspect it to be so? Because you believe two principles, one

^p —a Deo omnipotente. Fortun. ap. Aug. Disp. i. n. 17. ^q —quia et omnipotentem Deum colam. Faust. l. 20, c. 4.

^r —Quomodo autem et condere potuit creaturas, non subsistente materia? Si enim de non extantibus, consequetur has visibiles creaturas meliores esse, et omnibus virtutibus plenas. Manes ap. Arch. n. 14, p. 27. ^s Ego duas naturas esse dico, unam bonam, et alteram malam, et eam quidem, quæ bona est, in quibusdam partibus habitare. —Si enim dicimus monarchiam unius naturæ, et omnia Deum replere, et nullum esse extra eum locum, quis erit creaturæ susceptor? ubi gehenna ignis? ubi tenebræ exteriores? ubi fletus? Manes ap. Arch. n. 14, p. 26. ^t See Beauf. T. i. p. 505, 506.

^u Ipsi enim dicunt, Deum genti tene-

brarum æternum carcerem præparare, quam dicunt esse inimicam Deo. Contr. Adim. c. 7, n. 1.

^x Ουτος δυο θεους θεος αγνητης, αυτοφους, αιδιος, ενα τη εις αντικειμενοι, και τον μεν αγαθον, τον δε πονηρον ειστηνται. ap. Arch. n. 7, p. 9.

^y πολλης θεος σεβειν ο μανηχιος προτεπειται. Socr. l. i. c. 22.

^z Unus Deus est, an duo? Plane unus. Quomodo ergo vos duos asseritis: nunquam in nostris quidem assertionibus duorum deorum auditum est nomen. Sed tu unde hoc suspicaris, cupio scire. Quia bonorum et malorum duo principia traditis. Est quidem quod duo principia confitemur, sed unum ex his Deum vocamus, alterum Hylem: aut ut communiter, et usitate dixerim, dæmonem. Faust. l. 21, in.

⁶ good,

'good, the other bad. It is true, we believe two principles: 'but one of these we call God, the other Hyle; or sometimes, 'in common discourse, the devil.' However, he adds afterwards: 'I own that ^a we sometimes call the adverse nature god: 'not that it is so esteemed by us, but by those who worship it: 'even as the apostle speaks of the god of this world blinding the 'eyes of them that believe not.' See 2 Cor. iv. 4.

They likewise considered God as the creator of the heavens and the earth, and all things that are therein, as ^b Augustine assures us; which is very different from what is said of them by ^c Athanasius and ^d Rufinus. Forasmuch therefore as some writers deny that the Manichees ascribed the creation of the world to the good principle, and some other heretics also are said to have disowned God as creator, I shall put down a passage or two more from ^e Augustine, and ^f the author *De Fide*, where they allow that the Manichees spoke of God as the maker of the world. And Titus of Bostra, giving an account of their notion upon this head, says that ^g the universe, according to them, consisted indeed of a mixture of good and bad, but was formed by the good principle, that is, God. For the evil principle knew nothing beforehand of the formation of the world. Besides, I remember that I alleged a passage to this purpose ^h before, when I shewed their agreement with other Christians. And Beaufobre ⁱ might be consulted upon this head.

The Manichees believed a consubstantial trinity, or three persons of the same substance. I ^k have already taken some notice

^a Nan nec diffiteor, etiam interdum nos adversam naturam nuncupare deum, sed non hoc secundum nostram fidem, verum juxta præsumentum jam in eam nomen a cultoribus suis, qui eam imprudenter existimant deum, &c. ib. ad fin.

^b Vos autem fatemini universum istum mundum, qui nomine coeli et terræ significatur, habere auctorem et fabricatorem Deum, et Deum bonum. De Mor. Manich. c. x. n. 16.

^c Καὶ γὰρ κακίνοι [μανιχαῖοι] μόνον ἀχρὶς ὀνομαλὸς ἀγαθὸν θεὸν ὀνομάζουσιν, καὶ ἔργον μὲν αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐκπεπρωμένον οὐκ ἀσφαλὲς δεικνύειν δύναται· τὸν δὲ ἀληθινὸν καὶ οὐτως οὐκ αὐτὸν, τὸν ποιητὴν ἕραν καὶ γῆς, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀσφατῶν ἀρετῆται, πάντως εἰσι μυθολογοῖ. Ath. Ep. Enc. ad. Ep. Æg. et Lib. n. 16, T. i. p. 285, E.

^d Tum deinde quod mundum a malo factum dicit, Deum creatorem negat. Ruf. in Symb. ap. Hieron. Opp. T. 5, p. 142.

^e Proinde mundum a natura boni, hoc est a natura Dei factum confi-

tentur quidem, sed de commixtione boni et mali, quæ facta est, quando inter se utraque natura pugnavit. Aug. de Hær. cap. 46.

Iste autem, cujus nomen in eodem libro non comperi, detestatur Deum mundi fabricatorem: cum Manichæi, quamquam librum Geneseos non accipiant, atque blasphemant, Deum tamen bonum fabricasse mundum, etsi ex aliena natura atque materia, consiteantur. Contr. adv. Leg. et Proph. l. i. c. i.

^f Manichæus enim duas dicit esse naturas, unam bonam, et alteram malam; bonam quæ fecit mundum, malam de qua factus est mundus. De Fid. c. 49, in.

^g Γίγνεται τοίνυν μίξις καὶ κρασις, τῶτοι φησι τὸν τρόπον τῆς τε κατὰ πρῶτης δυνάμεως τῆς ἀγαθῆς, καὶ τῆς κατὰ δεύτερης δυνάμεως τῆς κακῆς ἐκ μιᾶς γινώσκειτο το δὲ πᾶν, ὑπο τῆς ἀγαθῆς ὁλοκληρῶν· ἡ γὰρ ἀν' ἀπορροπῆς ἡ κακία κόσμῳ γίνεσθαι. Tit. l. i. p. 68, m.

of this. I observe here a few more particulars as proofs of this, though I do not design to examine their opinion nicely.

Augustine says the ¹ Manichees never dared to deny that the Father and the Son are consubstantial.

Secundinus begins his letter to Augustine in this manner: 'I ^m give thanks to the ineffable and most sacred Majesty, and to Jesus Christ, his first-begotten, king of all lights. I also humbly give thanks to the Holy Spirit.'

Faustus has a remarkable passage where he says: 'We worship one deity of God the Father Almighty, and Christ his Son, and the Holy Ghost, under a three-fold appellation. But the Father we believe to inhabit the supreme and most sublime light, which Paul calls inaccessible. [1 Tim. vi. 16.] The Son we think dwells by his power in the sun, by his wisdom in the moon: the Holy Spirit, the third Majesty, has the air for his residence.'

Here therefore I observe that the Manichees are said to worship the sun. So ^o Socrates expressly. Libanius too owned that ^p they worshipped the sun in a secondary sense: and it is very likely that they paid some respect both to the sun and the moon on ^q account of the residence of the Son of God therein, as just mentioned by Faustus.

However, let us likewise see what others say. We find Augustine himself charging them with ^r the worship of the sun and the moon. But in the dispute with Fortunatus, when called upon to declare if he had seen any thing criminal in their worship, he owned that ^s he had observed nothing amiss in the prayers, at which he was present, except that they turned themselves to-

^a See before, p. 439, note ^t. ^v See B. T. 2, p. 360, 361. ^k See p. 439, &c.

¹ — Quia et numquam dicere ausi sunt, Patrem et Filium nisi unius esse substantiæ. Aug. Serm. 12, in PS. cap. x. n. xi. ^m Habeo et ago gratias ineffabili et sacratissimæ Majestati, ejusque primogenito omnium luminum regi Jesu Christo. Habeo gratias et supplex sancto refero Spiritui. Secund. ad Aug. Ep. in.

ⁿ Igitur nos Patris quidem Dei omnipotentis, et Christi filii ejus, et Spiritus Sancti unum idemque sub triplici appellatione colimus numen: sed Patrem quidem ipsum lucem incolere credimus summam ac principalem, quam Paulus alias inaccessibleem vocat: Filium vero in hac secunda ac visibili luce consistere; qui quoniam sit et ipse geminus, ut eum Apollolus novit, Christum dicens esse Dei vir-

tutem et Dei sapientiam; virtutem quidem ejus in sole habitare credimus, sapientiam vero in luna: nec non et Spiritus Sancti, qui est majestas tertia, aeris hunc omnem ambitum sedem fatemur ac diversorium. Faust. l. 20, c. 2.

^o — και τον ηλιον προσκυνησι διδασκει. Socr. l. i. c. 22, p. 56, A. ^p See before, p. 383.

^q — quod vel tu, vel quilibet alius rogatus, ubinam Deum suum credat habitare, respondere non dubitabit, in lumine: ex quo cultus hic meus omnium pene testimonio confirmatur. Faust. ib. l. 20, c. 2, f.

^r Solem etiam et lunam cum eis adorant et orant. Aug. T. 2. Ep. 236, al. 74.

^s Ego autem in oratione qua interfui nihil turpe fieri vidi: sed solum contra fidem animadverti—quod contra solem facitis orationem. Adv. Fortun. Disp. i. n. 3.

ward the sun. In another place he informs us, that ^t when they prayed they looked toward the sun in the day time, and toward the moon in the night. In another place he speaks of ^u their kneeling to the sun, or toward it. Alexander of Lycopolis says they ^x honour the sun and moon above all things, not as gods, but as the way by which we are to go to God. Titus of Bostra ascribes their respect to the sun to their supposition that ^y it was composed of parts of light entirely pure, and unfulled with a mixture of evil. And ^z Augustine seems to speak to the like purpose, or at least that they esteemed it a portion of light which God inhabits. Simplicius says they ^a thought the sun and moon to consist of parts of the good substance, and therefore honoured them.

Upon the whole, I believe we need not surmise any great harm in the respect they shewed the sun, considering that Faustus assures us they believed one God only under a threefold appellation, and considering what Augustine says of the prayers at which he was present. But it seems that when they prayed to God, for some reason or other they turned their faces toward the sun or the moon.

VII. 'The Manichees,' to use Augustine's ^b words, 'held ^c two principles, different and opposite, eternal and coeternal: ^d and two natures and substances, one good, the other evil, following herein other ancient heretics.'

In this ^e notion, as the same learned father says, they triumphed to a great degree, supposing it to afford the best account of the origin of evil.

And Epiphanius says that ^d by this scheme Mani endeavoured to free God from the charge of being the author of evil.

To

* *Oraciones faciunt ad solem per diem, quaquaversum circuit; ad lunam per noctem, si apparet; si autem non apparet, ad aquiloniam partem, qua sol cum occiderit ad orientem revertitur, stant orantes.* De Hær. c. 46.

^u Sol iste, cui genu flectitis, &c. De Mor. Manich. cap. 8, n. 13.

^x *Τὴν αἰὶν διὰ μαλίστα κλῆρον καὶ σελήνην, ὡς θεὸς, ἀλλ' ὡς ὁδὸν δι' ἧς ἐσμὲν πρὸς θεὸν ἀφικέσθαι.* Alex. L. p. 5, D. ^y *Ἐπειδὴ δὲ κλῆρον σελήνην καὶ ἀνέστη εἶναι, ὡς ὑπέδειξε, τὴν κακὴν διαφύεται.* Tit. contr. Manich. l. 2, p. 128, in.

^z Et ideo istum solem — *illi sic colunt ut particulam dicant esse lucis illius in qua habitat Deus.* De Gen. contr. Man. l. i. c. 3, n. 6.

^a *Πιστὴ δὲ καὶ περὶ τούτου ἀλλοιοῦται, τοῦ ὡς αὐτῶν τὰς ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μὲν, τὰς δύο*

φωστῆρας τιμᾶν, τὰς τῇ ἀγαθῇ μοίρᾳ λεγόμενας αὐτὰς. κ. λ. In Epictet. c. 34, p. 167.

^b *Iste duo principia inter se diversa et adversa, eademque aeterna et coeterna, hoc est, semper fuisse, composuit: duasque naturas atque substantias, boni scilicet et mali, sequens alios antiquos hæreticos, opinatus est.* Aug. de Hær. c. 46.

^c *Hic fortasse quis dicat, Unde ipsa peccata, et omnino unde malum? Si ab homine, unde homo? Si ab angelo, unde angelus? Quos ex Deo esse cum dicitur, quamvis recte vereque dicatur, videntur tamen imperitis et minus valentibus acriter res abditas intueri, quasi per quamdam catenam ad Deum mala et peccata connecti. Hac quaestione regnare se putant.* De Duab. Anim. c. 8, n. 10.

^d *Μανὶς διδωμένος κακίας ὑπεξαιρῶν τοῦ θ. α.*

To the like purpose speaks^e Jerom, and^f Titus of Bosfra, and^g Simplicius.

Indeed this difficult question, of the origin of evil, was the ruin of these men, and of many others. They perplexed and confounded themselves, and they endeavoured to puzzle and confound all other people. Augustine^h intimates as much.

Theodoret's account is to this purpose: 'Maniⁱ taught two eternal beings, God and matter. God he called light, matter darkness: and the light good, matter evil. He called them also by other names. Light is a good tree, full of good fruits: matter an evil tree, bearing fruits agreeable to it's root.'

Photius, observing the contents of a work of Agapius, a Manichæan writer, says: 'He^k advanceth a bad principle, self-existent and opposite to God; which he sometimes calls nature, sometimes matter, sometimes Satan, and the devil, and the prince and god of this world, and the like.'

Their opinion is laid down by^l Fortunatus at the beginning of his second dispute with Augustine.

Jerom^m often takes notice of this doctrine of the Manichees.

This doctrine Mani teaches in his letter to Marcellus. Heⁿ wonders how any Christians can think that God made Satan and other evil things. This notion, and the consequences of it, are much discoursed of in The Dispute of^o Archelaus.

After all this, it may be still proper to put down, in the margin at least, the words of Mani himself, near the beginning of his Epistle of the Foundation, which was so much admired by his followers, and is largely cited by Augustine. 'There^p were,'

δευ. κ. λ. Epiph. H. 66, n. 16, p. 632. Vid. et n. 15, in.

^e Inde Manichæus, ut Deum a conditione malorum liberet, alterum mali inducit auctorem. Hier. in Naum. cap. 3, T. 3, p. 1588, in.

^f Κακίας γὰρ αἰτιὸν ἀποδείξει τὸν θεὸν βλαβείας, κ. λ. Tit. contr. Manich. l. i. p. 60, in. ap. Bafnag. et Canis. Lect. Ant. T. i.

^g ——— καὶ τὸ θαυμαστόν, ὅτι ταῦτα ταῦτα ἀνέπλασαν, διὰ θεοποίησιν δὲ τὴν ἐλάθειαν· μὴ βυλομένη γὰρ αἰτίαν τῆ κακίας τὸν θεὸν εἰπεῖν, ἀρχὴν ὑπερῆσαν τοῖς ἰδίοις τῆ κακίας, κ. λ. Simpl. in. Epist. Enchir. c. 34, p. 168.

^h Qui dum nimis querunt, unde sit malum, nihil reperiunt nisi malum. De Ut. Cred. c. 18, n. 36.

ⁱ Οὗτος δύο ἀγένητας καὶ αἰδίους ἐφασκεν ἑμὲν, θεὸν καὶ ὑλὴν· καὶ προσηγορεύει τὸν μὲν θεὸν φῶς, τὴν δὲ ὑλὴν σκοτὸς, κ. λ. Thdr. H. F. l. i. c. 26, p. 212. B. C.

^k Ἀρχὴν πομπῆς αὐτοποράτου ἀνταρῆσιν ἐξ αἰδίου τῷ θεῷ, ἢ πρὸς μὲν φῶς, ἀλλοτε

ὑλὴν, καὶ ἀλλοτε δὲ σάτανα, καὶ διαβολὴν, καὶ ἀρχὸν τῆ κοσμίας, καὶ θεὸν τῆ αἰωνίας τῆς. κ. λ. Ph. cod. 179, p. 404, in.

^l Disp. 2, sub in.

^m Ut non juxta Manichæum, et cæteras hæreses, (quæ factorem et materiam ponunt,) aliquid unde creaturæ factæ sint, antecesserit creaturas, sed omnia ex nihilo subsisterint. Hier. in Ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. 4. P. i. p. 435, in. Vid. eund. ad Ctes. Ep. 43. T. 4. P. 2, p. 480, infr. m. et Prol. Dial. adv. Pelag. ib. p. 485, in.

ⁿ Καὶ τὴν τὸν θεὸν τῆ σατανα, καὶ τὴν κακίαν αὐτῆς πραγμάτων λόγῳ τοῦ μὲν ποιητῆς καὶ δημιουργοῦ, θαυμαζέμεν μὲν ἐπερχεται. ap. Arch. c. 5, p. 7, f.

^o Ego duas naturas esse dico, unam bonam et alteram malam. ib. c. 14, p. 26.

^p Hæc quidem in exordio fuerunt, duæ substantiæ a sese divisæ. Et luminis quidem imperium tenebat Deus Pater, in sua sancta stirpe perpetuus, in virtute magnificus,

'were,' says he, 'in the beginning, two substances, divided
'from each other. The kingdom of light is held by God the
'Father, unchangeable, all-powerful, true in his nature, eternal,
'having in himself wisdom and vital powers.—His most splendid
'kingdom is founded upon light and blessed land, not to be
'shaken or moved by any.' But however, as he goes on,
'On^s one side of his illustrious and holy territories was the land
'of darkness, deep and wide, where dwelt fiery bodies, and all
'sorts of pestiferous things: beyond which are muddy waters,
'boisterous winds, dark smoke; and at the centre the dreadful
'prince and universal governor, having with him innumerable
'princes, of which he is the soul and source. And these are
'the five natures [or elements] of the pestiferous country.'

These five elements, as Augustine observes in plainer words,
are^r darkness, water, wind, fire, smoke. Darkness is the outmost,
within that water, within that wind, next fire, and the inmost
smoke; all which regions have their several inhabitants. In ano-
ther place^s Augustine mentions again these five elements, but in
a different order.

There were as many elements in the^t kingdom of light; air,
light, fire, water, wind: which, at the formation of the world,
were mixed with the bad elements.

Hence it appears that^u Mani ascribed to matter, the evil sub-
stance, the land of darkness, not only eternal existence, but
likewise motion and life, animal passions, and, as one would

magnificus, natura ipsa verus, æternitate
propria semper exultans, continens apud
se sapientiam et sensus vitales.—Ita autem
fundata sunt ejusdem splendidiſſim regna
super lucidam et beatam terram, ut a nullo
unquam aut moveri aut concuti possint.
Ap. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich. c. 13, n. 16.

^q Juxta unam vero partem ac latus il-
lustris illius ac sanctæ terræ erat tenebra-
rum terra profunda et immensa magnitu-
dine, in qua habitabant ignea corpora,
genera scilicet pestifera. Hic infinitæ te-
nebræ, ex eadem manantes natura inæsti-
mabiles cum propriis fortibus: ultra quas
erant aquæ cœnosæ ac turbidæ cum suis
inhabitantibus, quarum interius venti
horribiles ac vehementes cum suo principe
et genitoribus. Rursus regio ignea et cor-
ruptibilis cum suis ducibus et nationibus.
Pari modo introrsum gens caliginis ac fumi
plena, in qua morabatur immanis princeps
omnium et dux^r, habens circa se innumera-
biles principes, quorum omnium ipse erat
mens et origo. Hæcque fuerunt naturæ
quinque terræ pestiferæ. ap. Aug. ib. c.

14, n. 19.

^r Animadvertimus quin-
que naturas quasi partes unius naturæ,
quam vocat terram pestiferam. Hæ sunt
autem, tenebræ, aquæ, venti, ignis, fu-
mus; quas quinque naturas sic ordinat, ut
exterioreſ cæteris sint tenebræ, a quibus
numerare incipit. Intra tenebras aquas
constituit, intra aquas ventos, intra ventos
ignem, intra ignem fumum. Et habebant
istæ quinque naturæ sua quæque genera
inhabitorum. Contr. Ep. Manich. c.
28, n. 31.

^s —eque elementa
his nominibus nuncupant, fumum, tene-
bras, ignem, aquam, ventum. Aug. De.
Hær. c. 46. ^t His quinque ele-
mentis malis debellandis alia quinque
elementa de regno et substantia Dei missa
esse, et in illa pugna fuisse permixta; fumo
aera, tenebris lucem, igni malo ignem bo-
num, aquæ malæ aquam bonam, vento
malo ventum bonum. Id ibid.

^u ἀρὴν ἑκατέρωθεν τῶν παρα τῇ μακροτῇ ὁμι-
ζομένων ἐναντίων, ἡσυχία ζῶσα τὴν καὶ ἀγνῶστον
ὀνομαζέται. Tit. l. i. p. 65.

think,

think, reason or intelligence. If the inhabitants of those regions had not reason originally, they seem to have gained it afterwards.

Upon this point I shall mention a thought^x of Beaufobre, which is to this purpose. 'Titus of Bostra observes this absurdity in the Manichæan scheme, that^y they ascribe an unreasonable life only to dæmons: and yet those dæmons are represented shewing great art and skill. But,' says Beaufobre, 'Titus did not consider that the Manichees do not ascribe such ability to the dæmons till after they had seized on the parts of light which were devoured by them, and became incorporated with them.' Whether this be right I cannot say: I shall mention an observation concerning this matter by and by.

'As for the devil,' to take the words of^z Beaufobre, 'Mani did not believe him to be properly eternal, forasmuch as he gave him a father: which supposition he built upon the words of our Saviour in John viii. 44. According to him the father of the devil was matter agitated in a violent, irregular, and tumultuous manner.'

That learned writer does not refer to the proper vouchers for proof of this account. I shall therefore add a few references in the margin, taken from The Dispute of Archelaus, where^a Mani is represented quoting that text of St. John's gospel in this manner, that 'the father of the devil is a liar and a murderer:' where likewise he speaks^b of the devil as having no former or creator but his own malice, whence he sprang.

This notion of the origin of Satan may seem strange: and yet perhaps it is not much stranger than the opinion of those who thought that plants grew up where no seeds had been sown: and that animals in water and on the land, having sexes, sprung

^x See Beauf. Hist. de Manich. T. 2, p. 410, 411.

^y οὗτοι πεφουγασιν προσωποποιήσαντες αὐτὴν λογισμοῖς τε καὶ γυναιξί. Tit. l. i. p. 70, sub in.

^z B. T. i. p. 179, and see him again T. 2. p. 263.

^a Et alio in loco, patrem diaboli mendacem et homicidam esse confirmat [Salvator Christus]. Manes ap. Arch. c. 13, p. 24.—Cum loquitur mendacium de suis propriis loquitur, quoniam mendax est, sicut et pater ejus. ib. n. 29, p. 48. Conf. Beauf. T. 2, p. 263.

^b Si vero consideretis, quomodo generentur filii hominum, invenietis non esse Dominum hominis creatorem, sed alium, qui et ipse ingenuitæ est nature, cujus conditor nullus, nec creator, nec factor est, sed sola malitia sua talem eum protulit. ap. Arch.

n. 14, p. 27.

^c — quia nisi talis aliqua vis esset in istis elementis, non plerumque nascerentur ex terra quæ ibi feminata non essent: nec animalia tam multa, nulla marium feminarumque commixtione præcedente, sive in terra, sive in aqua, quæ tamen crescunt, et coeundo alia pariunt, cum illa nullis coeuntibus parentibus orta sint. Ang. De. Trin. l. 3. cap. 8, n. 13. Quod si animalia quædam vento et aura concipere solere, omnibus notum est.—Lact. Inst. l. 4, c. 12, sub in. Nec tamen commoveat aliquem, quod animalia quædam de terra nasci videntur. Hæc enim non terra per se gignit, sed spiritus Dei, sine quo nihil gignitur. l. 2, c. 8, p. 183. Vid. Id. ib. l. 1. c. 8, p. 43.

up out of the genial virtue of the elements alone, descended from no parents. There is this difference only, that these persons, it is likely, ascribed that genial virtue of the elements to an intelligent and powerful cause, even † God.

Here, therefore, I insert the observation deferred before, which is this: since Beaufobre allows that, according to the Manichees, the devil, who was not properly eternal, was formed by the violent and irregular motion of eternal matter; and since Augustine expressly says, that the elements in the kingdom of darkness begot their several princes; in like manner, perhaps, the land of darkness, once irrational, gained reason, or cunning and skill, by some violent and tumultuous agitations. Or, possibly, they never ascribed reason to dæmons, though they allowed them to have a great deal of cunning.

I beg leave to observe farther, that † Augustine often speaks of mind in matter, according to the Manichæan scheme: as does † Mani himself in his Epistle of the Foundation. And Augustine thinks he has a great advantage, in his argument with them, when he observes ‡ how many good things they placed in the evil nature; such as life, power, memory, intellect, proportion and order.

Their doctrine of two principles the Manichees endeavoured to support by texts of the New Testament. They often argued from ^h those words of our Saviour, Matt. vii. 18. *A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit:* and * from the seventh chapter of the epistle to the

† Beaufobre has exactly the like thought, though I was not aware of it when I wrote what is above. However I here transcribe his words. Il ne faut pourtant pas s'imaginer, qu'il crût le Demon éternel. Sans doute il le faisoit naître du mouvement déréglé de la Matière, comme d'anciens philosophes croyoient, que les animaux étoient nez de la corruption de la terre. C' étoit le sentiment des Manichéens, qu'on attribue aussi aux Priscillianistes. Nec natura ejus [Diaboli] opificium Dei sit, sed eum ex chao et tenebris emeruisse. Leo Ep. xv. N^o. 5, p. 452. Beauf. T. i. p. 388.

^d Quinque enim elementa, quæ genuerunt principes proprios, genti tribuunt tenebrarum. De Hæc. cap. 46. sub in.

^e Hinc enim et mali substantiam quamdam credebam esse talem, et habere suam molem terram, et deformem, sive crassam, quam terram, et deformem, sive tenuem et subtilem, sicut est aeris corpus, quam malignam mentem per illam terram repentem imaginantur. Confess. l. 5, c. 7. n. 20. Hæc

dixi, ut, si fieri potest, tandem dicere designatis, malum esse terram per immensum profundam et longam; malum esse mentem per terram vagantem; malum esse quinque antra elementorum—malum esse animalia in illis nata elementis. De M. Manich. c. 9. n. 14.

^f — in qua morabatur immanis princeps omnium et dux, habens circa se innumerabiles principes, quorum omnium ipse erat mens atque origo. ap. Aug. contr. Epist. Manich. c. 15, n. 19.

^g — ita errantes, ita delirantes, — ut non videant, et in eo quod dicunt naturam summi mali, ponere se tanta bona, ubi ponunt vitam, potentiam,—memoriam, intellectum, temperiem—mensuras, numeros,—ordinem. De Nat. Boni. cap. 41.

^h Cui enim oportet credi? magistris vestris istis,—aut Salvatori Christo dicenti, sicut scriptum est in Evangeliorum libro, Non potest arbor bona malos fructus facere—? ap. Arch. n. 13, p. 24. Vid. et n. 5, p. 7.

* See Beaufobre T. 2, p. 253.

Romans,

Romans, where the apostle speaks of two laws, or two powers; one the understanding or reason, the other the flesh or the members of the fleshly body, which are in perpetual opposition: and from ¹ John v. 19. *The whole world lies in wickedness*, or the evil one; and from other texts which need not to be particularly mentioned.

VIII. According to the Manichees the formation of this world was occasional, owing to an attempt of the kingdom of darkness upon the kingdom of light. Augustine expresseth himself briefly in his summary account of Manichæism: ‘They ^k own, indeed, that the world was made by the good nature, that is, the nature of God, but out of a mixture of good and evil, which happened when the two natures fought together.’

There is somewhat about this fight in ¹ the fragments of Mani’s letter Of the Foundation. But there must have been more said of it in that part of the letter which Augustine did not answer, and therefore did not quote. For want of which I shall be obliged to take the account of this matter from other authors.

Theodoret says, ‘There ^m being a prodigious tumult and intestine war in the kingdom of Hyle, as they contended and fought with each other, they exceeded the bounds of their own territories, and came to the confines of light: at the fight of which they were greatly surpris’d and delighted, and did all they could to lay hold of and mix the light with themselves.’

Titus of Bostra says, that ‘ⁿ matter having made the inroad beforementioned, the good being sent out a power or spirit, to which the Manichees give what name they please, to reduce matter to better order, which was in some measure effected; for matter was greatly delighted at the sight of that power, and devoured it, and thereby was rendered more tame.’

In The Acts of Archelaus this affair is related after this manner: ‘Darkness, ^o exceeding it’s limits, fought with light.

¹ Ego duas naturas esse dico, unam bonam, alteram malam,—sicut ait Joannes: Totus mundus in maligno positus est, non in Deo. ap. Arch. n. 14, p. 26.

² Proinde mundum a natura boni, hoc est, a natura Dei factum, continentur quidem, sed de commixtione boni et mali, quæ facta est, quando inter se utraque natura pugnavit. De Hær. c. 46.

³ Unde si tibi videtur, inquit, ausculta prius quæ fuerint ante constitutionem mundi, et quo pacto prælium sit agitatam, ut polis luminis sejungere naturam ac tenebrarum. ap. Aug. contra Ep. Manich. c. 12, n. 15. Vid. et libr. De Fid. contr. Manich. cap. xi.

πολλοὶς ὑψίον διασπασταὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν εὐλὴν καὶ τῆς ταύτης καρπὸς πρὸς ἀλλήλης τῇ δὲ πολέμῳ συγαντος, καὶ τῶν μὲν διακοινοῦν, τῶν δὲ διακοινοῦν, μέχρι τῶν ὁρῶν τῆς φωτὸς αὐτὴς ἀφικεῖσθαι ὡς τὸ φῶς διασπασμένης, ἠσθήναι τε ἐπ’ αὐτῇ, καὶ θαυμάσαι καὶ βυβληθῆναι πᾶσιν κατ’ αὐτὴν γράττεισθαι, καὶ ἀρπάσαι, καὶ κρατῆσαι τῇ φωτὶ τοῦ ἰδίου σκοτὸς Thdr. T. iv. p. 212. C.

⁴ Tit. contr. Manich. l. 2, p. 68.

⁵ ——— Γνωτὰ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν πατέρα τοῦ σκοτὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς αὐτῆς ἐπιδεδημένος, προσάλλειν ἐξ αὐτῆς δύσιν, λεγόμενὴν μητέρα τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ αὐτὴν προσέδλιναι τοὺς πρῶτον ἀνθρώπους, κ. λ. ap. Arch. n. 7, p. 10.

‘When the good Father [that is God] perceived that darkness was come into his country, he detached from him a power called the Mother of Life. This power formed the first man, and invested him with the five elements, wind, light, water, fire, air. Thus equipped he went down to fight with darkness: but ^p the princes of darkness fighting against him devoured a part of his armour, which is the soul.’ ‘The first man,’ as it follows in those Acts, ‘being overpowered looked up to God, who taking pity on him sent to his ^q relief another power called the Living Spirit; who descending reached out his hand to him and rescued him: but he left the soul below.—Then the Living Spirit created the world. He created the lights out of the souls that remained, and appointed the firmament to revolve. At length he created the earth.’

Who is meant by the Living Spirit is not certain; whether the Word, or the Holy Spirit, or some other intelligent being: but it seems to be rather more probable, that ^r hereby is meant some spirit inferior to the divine persons; and that Mani was of the same opinion with divers others in former times, who, judging the creation of this visible world unworthy of God, ascribed that work to some inferior intelligence.

‘And,’ as Beaufobre says, ‘if we reduce to simple ideas all which is said concerning the first man, his descent, his armour, his combats, a part of his armour taken from him, and devoured by the princes of darkness, the meaning may amount to this: that the soul is a celestial substance, which God has thought fit to mix with matter for making the world; and that this was occasioned by an enterprize of matter, which God foresaw, but did not think fit to hinder.’ Or, as he expresseth it in another place: ‘They ^u supposed that the first man descended from heaven to combat the powers of darkness: and that he was armed with five celestial elements, air, wind, water, fire and light. Matter devoured a part of his armour, which is the soul. In general God permitted that the celestial substance should be mingled with the terrestrial, or bad substance, which occasioned the creation of the world.’

The same learned and judicious author has some other observations ^x relating to this matter, taken from the obscure and

Ἦ οἱ δὲ τῆ σκοτὸς ἀρχόντες ἀντιπολεμῶντες αὐτῷ ἔφαγον ἐκ τῆς πανοπτίας αὐτῆς, ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ. ^q ib. — καὶ ἐπετίθειν ἑτέρῳ δυνάμει προδελθῆναι ὑπ’ αὐτῆς, λεγομένην ζῶν πνεῦμα — ἐκτότε ἦν κατελείβε κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν. — Τότε ζῶν πνεῦμα ἐκτίσε τὴν κόσμον. — Τότε πάλιν τὸ ζῶν πνεῦμα

ἐκτίσε τὴν φωστῆρα, καὶ ἐστὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ληΐσας, καὶ οὕτως ἐποίησε τὸ γένος κακῶν καὶ πάλιν ἐκτίσε τὴν γῆν. ^{ib.} p. 10, 11.

^r See Beauf. T. 2, p. 359.

^u ib. T. 2, p. 390. ^u ib. p. 555.

^x as before, p. 390, 391, 392.

figurative style of the eastern people, and the language in which Mani's works were written, which might not be well understood by the Greeks and Romans.

And I shall add here a passage of Fortunatus, who, disputing with Augustine, says: 'Hence' evidently appears our ancient 'original, that before the formation of the world souls were 'sent against the contrary nature to subdue it by their virtue 'and patience, that the victory and glory might be given to 'God. For, as the apostle says: (Eph. vi. 12.) *We wrestle not 'only against flesh and blood, but also against principalities and powers, 'against spiritual wickednesses, and the rulers of darknesses.'*

To proceed: The 'first work of the creator was to separate the parts of the celestial substance, which, though mingled with matter, had preserved their purity, and to make of them the sun and the moon; which is agreeable to the words of Augustine: The 'Manichees say, that 'those vessels, the sun and moon, were 'made of the pure substance of God; or of that substance of 'God which had preserved it's purity.' He presently afterwards explains what is meant by the substance of God, saying, that 'the moon was made of the good water, the sun of the good 'fire;' that is, according to the Manichæan sentiment.

But it should be observed, that whereas Augustine here and elsewhere often useth the phrase, *the substance of God*, it seems likely, that 'thereby the Manichees (if they also used the same phrase) did not mean the divine substance, or nature, which they always reckoned incorruptible, inviolable, immutable, but only the substance from God, the celestial substance, the 'substance of his kingdom or empire. I suppose that every one will perceive as much from what will be hereafter said of their denying the humanity of Christ, and the incarnation of the Word, and all union of the divine nature with the human. And it might be collected from what has been already produced concerning their sentiments of the divine perfections.

In a word, not to be too minute, the 'Creator formed the sun and moon out of those parts of light which had preserved their original purity. The visible or inferior heavens (for now we

^a Hinc ergo apparet antiquitas temporum nostrorum, quam repetimus, et annorum nostrorum, antemundi constitutionem hoc more missas esse animas contra contrariam naturam, ut eandem sua passione subscientes, victoria Deo redderetur. Nam dixit idem apostolus, &c. Fortun. Disp. 2. n. 12, fin. ap. Aug. T. 8. ^z See B. T. 2, p. 361, 362. ^a Quas itidem naves de substantia Dei pura perhibent fabricatas.—Naves autem illas, id est, duo

celi luminaria, ita distinguunt, ut lunam dicant factam ex bona aqua, solem vero ex igne bono. Aug. De H. c. 46.

^b Beaufobre has spoken largely to this point. See him T. i. p. 227.—234. p. 592, 593, 529, &c. and T. 2, p. 339, &c.

^c His quinque elementis debellandis alia quinque elementa de regno et substantia Dei missa esse, et in illa pugna fuisse permixta. Aug. de Har. cap. 46.

^d See B. ib. p. 364.

do not speak of the supreme heaven), and the rest of the planets, were formed of those parts of light which were but little corrupted by matter. The rest he left in our world, which are no other than those parts of light which had suffered most by the contagion of matter.

The ^e Creator formed not the earth, until after he had made the heavens and the stars. This appears from the account before taken out of The Acts of Archelaus.

And that we may the better conceive of all this, we may observe and rectify a wrong account of Augustine. 'Mani,' says ^f he, 'teaches not only that man, but that the whole world was formed by the mixture of two coeternal natures, one good the other bad, in such a manner however as to ascribe the formation of the world to the good God.' This, says ^g Beaufobre, is not just. Do not the sun and moon, which were made out of the pure celestial substance, belong to the world? It is our earth properly, with it's atmosphere, and it's heavens, which were composed of two substances: which is the occasion that life and death, good and evil, reign here. The Manichees, certainly, as that learned writer goes on, were not orthodox upon the article of the creation of the world: but, setting aside their particular error, they had noble ideas of the manner in which God made the world. The disorders that are in the world, says ^h Fortunatus, sufficiently shew that it was made out of two substances; at the same time things have not come into that form and proportion which constitutes the world, but by the authority and command of one only. So my author.

IX. The Manichæan notion of the creation of man may be seen in ⁱ Beaufobre, taken from Mani himself, Archelaus, Augustine, Titus of Bosra, Theodoret and others.

A succinct account of what he says at large is to this purpose: The ^k daemons, foreseeing that God would insensibly withdraw the light, or the reasonable soul, which he had sent into matter, and leave them to themselves, or punish them for their late attempt, thought of a method to detain it. They had seen the first man, who came to fight them; and they still discerned his form in the sun, or the heavens. Upon this model they formed the human body, thereby to attract souls; who, not perceiving

^e ib. p. 367.

^f Manichæus ex commixtione duarum naturarum coeternarum, boni scilicet et mali, non solum hominem sed universum mundum constare dicit, et ad eum omnia pertinentia: ita sane, ut ipsam fabricam mundi, quamvis ex commixtione boni et mali, Deo bono et artifice tribuat. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 186.

^g as before, p. 367, 368.

^h Facta consonant, sed quia inconvenientia sibi sunt, ac per hoc ergo constat non esse unam substantiam, licet ex unius jussione eadem ad compositionem mundi hujus et faciem venerint. Fortunat. Disp. i. n. 13.

ⁱ Hist. de Manich. T. 2, p. 399.—418.

^k ib. p. 410.

the snare which the devil had laid for them, entered the body, and were touched with the pleasure afforded by the organs of the senses, and especially that of concupiscence. Pleasure seduces and transports them, and they become delighted with their new habitation. Hereby they are led to propagate, and thus they forge their own chains and build their own prisons.

Some passages of Mani's Epistle of the Foundation, concerning the formation of man, may be seen in ¹ Augustine.

I think it is past dispute that Mani did ascribe the formation of the human body to matter, or the devil, or the evil principle. I refer for this purpose to some passages in The Acts ^m of Archelaus and ⁿ Epiphanius; and shall transcribe in the margin some passages of Mani ^o in his letter to Menoch, where he speaks of Satan being the author of bodies, as God is of souls. Augustine's article upon this point in ^p his summary account of Manichæism, as likewise what he says ^q elsewhere, deserves our attention.

Alexander of Lycopolis speaks to this purpose: 'Matter ^r [or Hyle] perceiving in the sun a human form, became ambitious to make a man out of his own substance. For this purpose he placed in him the utmost of his own powers, together with as much soul as he could obtain. By which means man became superior to all animals, who are mortal like him, and partook largely of the divine power; for he is an image of the divine power.'

What I have here transcribed from Alexander may be compared with ^s The Acts of Archelaus, and ^t Epiphanius.

¹ ———— *dicens, nosse te cupere cujusmodi sit nativitas Adæ et Evæ, utrum verbo sint*

idem prolati, an primogeniti ex corpore.

Man. ap. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich. c. 12.

n. 14. Vid. et Aug. de Natura Boni. cap.

46. ^m Vid. Arch. n. 10, p. 19, 20.

n. 14, p. 27. ⁿ H. 66, n. 30.

^o Sicut ergo auctor animarum Deus est,

ita corporum auctor per concupiscentiam

diabolus est, &c. ap. Aug. op. Imp. l.

3, c. 174. vid. et. c. 175, 176.

^p Adam et Evam ex parentibus princi-

pius fumi asserunt natos, cum patre eorum

nomine Sacras sociorum suorum fetus om-

nium devorasset, et quicquid inde com-

mixtum divinæ substantiæ ceperat, cum

uxore concubens in carne prolis tam-

quam tenacissimo vinculo colligasset. De

H. c. 46. ^q ———— ita fane, ut

ipsam fabricam mundi, quamvis ex com-

mixtione boni et mali, Deo bono et arti-

fici tribuat; animalia vero, et cuncta quæ

nascuntur e terra, et ipsum hominem, ope-

ra esse dicat malignæ mentis, quam genti

adhibuit tenebrarum. Hinc est, quod ani-

mam primam dicit a Deo lucis mansisse, et

accepisse illam fabricam corporis, ut eam

frano suo regeret. Non enim hoc de ho-

mine, sed de anima bona dicit, quam Dei

partem atque naturam universo mundo, et

omnibusquæ in eo sunt, opinatur esse per-

mixtam, in homine autem per concupi-

scientiam decipi. Quam concupiscentiam,

quod sepe inculcandum est, non vitium

substantiæ bonæ, sed malam vult esse sub-

stantiam. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, cap. 186.

^r Καὶ εἰκόνα δὲ ἐν ἡλῷ ἐκράσθη τῇ αὐτῇ,

οὐκ ἐστὶ τὸ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ εἶδος, καὶ ἀντιφύλα-

μισθασθαι τὴν ὕλην ποιῆσαι τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐξ

αὐτῆς, κατὰ τὴν διὰ πάσης αὐτῆς τῆς δυνα-

μείως μίξιν, ἔχοντα καὶ αὐτὰ τῆς ψυχῆς,

πολλὴ μὲντοι συμμεισθῆναι τὸ εἶδος, ἐκ τῶ

πλείονος τὴν πορὰ τὰ ἄλλα ὄντα ζῶα τῆς δυνα-

μείως τῆς θείας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μετασχημῖντας

χρῆν γὰρ αὐτοῖς θείας δυνάμειος εἰκόνα. Alex.

p. 5. B. C. ^s ap. Arch. n. 7, p.

12. ^t H. 66, n. 26, et 30.

And Mani, in a passage of his Letter of the Foundation, preserved ^a in Augustine, speaks of man as being a whole little world, uniting in himself the image of all powers, both celestial and terrestrial. Moreover, the Manichees, as Augustine says, believed that in ^{*} Adam was a large portion of light, that is, of the heavenly substance.

Some passages of Faustus likewise may confirm the supposition of the Manichees not ascribing the formation of the human body to God. 'It is true,' says ^y he, 'God is not the author of that birth which brings us into the world, men and women, males and females.' Again, says ^z Faustus, 'there are two times of our nativity; one, when nature brings us into this world under the chains of carnal affections; the other, when we are born again, and are converted from error to truth, of which Christ speaks in the gospel, in his conference with Nicodemus, saying, *Unless a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.*' Which doctrine Faustus endeavours to support by long quotations from several of St. Paul's epistles.

As Beaufobre says, they ^a pretended it was impossible that a holy and good God should join a pure and celestial soul with a terrestrial, sensitive, animal soul, whose affections resist reason, and carry the man to actions he disapproves. And they argued, that the ordinary way in which men come into the world shewed it was not God who formed them at first. This argument of theirs is largely represented in The ^b Acts of Archelaus.

X. Moreover, the Manichees supposed that there were in man two souls. Augustine wrote ^c a book on purpose against this opinion: but it was a necessary consequence of their sentiment about two principles. There are, according ^d to them, two eternal natures, both living and animated: and both enter

^a In eadem enim construebantur et continebantur omnium imagines, celestium ac terrenarum virtutum; ut pleni videlicet orbis, id quod formabatur, similitudinem obtineret. Man. ap. Aug. de Nat. Bon. c. 46.

^x Mala non vacuum fuisse dicit Adam, sed ejus minus habuisse, multoque plus lucis. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 186.

^y Magis ac magis ostendit, nativitatem hanc, quæ nos mares fecit ac feminas, — non eam esse in qua Deus operatur, cum hominem format. Faust. l. 24, sub fin.

^z Quoniam quidem et nativitatis nostræ tempora duo sunt, unum illud, quo nos irretitos carnalibus vinculis in lucem hanc natura produxit, alterum vero, cum veritas nos ex errore

conversos ad se regeneravit initiatos ad fidem. Quod tempus secundæ nativitatis in Evangelio Jesus significans dixit, &c. Faust. l. 24, sub in.

^a T. 2, p. 416.

^b Si vero consideretis, quomodo generentur filii hominum, invenietis, non esse Dominum hominis creatorem, sed alium. — Est igitur vobis hominibus commixtio cum uxoribus vestris de hujusmodi occasione descendens. Cum quis vestrum carnalibus aliisque cibis fuerit satiatus, tunc ei concupiscentiæ oboritur incitatio, &c. ap. Arch. c. 14, p. 27.

^c De duabus Animabus contra Manicheos. Opp. T. 3.

^d See Beauf. T. 2, p. 420.

into the composition of man. I place in the margin ^e a passage of Augustine of some considerable length, taken from his summary account of Manichæism in his book *Of Heresies*.

This was in ancient times a common opinion of many people, and was held by the Manichees. They ^f supposed that it was evidently taught by St. Paul in all those places where he opposes the flesh and the spirit, the old man and the new man, the law of the mind and the law of the members. These two men, these two laws, these two principles, are in man: and they are always contrary to each other: the spirit opposeth the desires of the flesh, and the flesh those of the spirit: but contrary desires and wills cannot proceed from one and the same cause purely spiritual. There are therefore two souls in man, two active principles; one the source and cause of vicious passions, deriving it's origin from matter, the other the cause of the ideas of just and right, and of inclinations to follow those ideas, deriving it's original from God.

XI. Though the Manichees did not receive the Old Testament, nor admit the Mosaic account of the creation, they supposed the world to have had a beginning, as we have seen already; and Adam and Eve to have been the first pair, and the parents of mankind. This appears from the very beginning ^g of the famous Epistle of the Foundation.

The Manichees, as Augustine says, believed that in Adam was a large portion of light; that is, of the celestial substance. Again, we learn from him, that ⁱ 'they said Adam and Eve were made by the princes of darkness; but Adam had in him a great abundance of the particles of light, with but few particles of darkness: for that reason he lived holily a good while. At length the adverse part in him prevailed, and he knew

^e Carnalem concupiscentiam, qua caro concupiscit adversus spiritum, non ex vi-tiata in primo homine natura nobis inesse infirmitatem; sed substantiam volunt esse contrariam, sic nobis adhaerentem, ut quando liberamur atque purgamur, separetur a nobis, et in sua natura etiam ipsa immortaliter vivat: easque duas animas, vel duas mentes, unam bonam, alteram malam, in uno homine inter se habere conflictum, quando caro concupiscit adversus spiritum, et spiritus adversus carnem. De Har. c. 46. sub fin. ^f See Beauf. T. 2, p. 421. ^g De eo igitur, — de quo mihi significasti, dicens, nosse te cupere, cujusmodi sit nativitas Adæ et

Evæ, &c. ap. Aug. Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 12, n. 14.

ⁱ Talis est namque apud vos opinio de Adamo et Eva. Longa fabula est, sed ex ea adtingam quod in præsentia fatis est. Adam dicitis sic a parentibus suis genitum, abortivis illis principibus tenebrarum, ut maximam partem lucis haberet in anima, et per exiguum gentis adversæ. Qui cum sancte viveret propter exsuperantem copiam boni, commotam tamen in eo fuisse adversam illam partem, ut ad concubitum declinaretur; ita eum lapsum esse et peccasse, sed vixisse postea sanctiorem. De Mor. Manich. c. 19, n. 73.

‘Eve.’ So then conjugal commerce was the first sin of these parents of mankind.

And, in The Acts of Archelaus it is said that ^k the princes, having made Adam after the form of the first man whom they had seen, made Eve likewise, giving her some of their own concupiscence, that she might deceive Adam.

XII. Hence we may be led to conclude that the Manichees must condemn marriage; and indeed those words of St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 3. are often applied to them. Mani himself says that ^l *concupiscence is the root of all evil*, quoting in that sense 1 Tim. vi. 10. It may be thought that ^m their condemning all manner of concupiscence, however regulated, appears in some words of Faustus, which I put in the margin: where he speaks of the first or natural birth, and of the second or spiritual birth.

This notion is handsomely confuted by ⁿ Titus of Bostra, in a passage which may be seen translated by ^o Beaufobre: but I presume I need not transcribe it here.

Faustus has particularly considered the charge brought against them, of teaching what the apostle calls *doctrines of devils*, 1 Tim. iv. 1. And, if Faustus may be relied upon, their doctrine upon ^p the article of marriage and virginity was much the same with that of the catholics, or orthodox Christians of that time. The churches of the catholics, he says, had in them almost as many professed virgins as married women. If the ^q catholics made virgins, without being liable to the charge of forbidding to marry, the same was true of them: they did not compel, they only exhorted. And he boldly says, that text of St. Paul is no more against them than against the catholics. This defence of Faustus is the fuller, if by their elect, who alone were forbidden to marry,

^k Τῆς δὲ πρῆς οὐσίας ἐκτίσαν, δόντες αὐτῇ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν, πρὸς τὸ ἐξαπατήσειν τὸν ἄδαν. ap. Arch. n. 10, p. 20.

^l Tolle denique malignæ hujus stirpis radicem, et statim te ipsam spiritalem contemplaris. Radix enim, ait scriptura, omnium malorum concupiscentia. Ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 175. Vid. et c. 176, 186, 187. ^m Modus quoque nascendi duplex est, unus ille furoris et intemperantiæ proprius, quo sumus a generatoribus turpiter et per libidinem sati: alius vero honestatis et sanctimonie, quo in Christo Jesu per Spiritum Sanctum sub bonorum doctrinis disciplinati sumus ad fidem, &c. Faust. l. 24, c. 1.

ⁿ Tit. contr. Manich. l. 2, p. 130, 131.

^o T. 2, p. 468, 469. ^p ——— nec videtis hinc, et virgines vestras demonio-

rum doctrina captas notari, et vos esse antistites demoniorum, qui certatim semper ad hanc eas incitatis professionem fursionibus vestris, ut pene jam maior in ecclesiis omnibus virginum apud vos quam mulierum numerositas habeatur? Faust. l. 30, cap. 4.

^q Non ergo est interim, quod vos existimetis solis hortamentis virgines facere, et non prohibitione nubendi. Nobis enim quoque hoc insitum est. — Quapropter et nos hortamur quidem volentes ut permaneant, non tamen cogimus invitas ut accedant. — Si igitur hoc modo virgines facere sine crimine est, extra culpam sumas et nos: sin quoquo genere virgines facere crimen est, rei estis et vos. Jam qua mente aut consilio hoc adversum nos capitulum proferatis, ego non video. ibid.

and were required to forbear eating flesh and drinking wine, be understood priests or ecclesiastics, as ^r Faustus intimates.

More may be seen concerning this point in (*) the author, to whom I have already often referred.

Upon the whole, considering what has been observed above concerning the origin of mankind, it may be reckoned more probable, that they rather tolerated marriage as an imperfect state, in regard to human weakness, than approved it. Perhaps we may apply to this case what ^s Augustine says of the Manichæan auditors eating flesh. They were indulged it, but yet it was a fault, he says, and to be forgiven only because they maintained the elect.

And I question whether Faustus be sincere, and may be relied upon in what he says of this matter. My doubts are owing to the very disadvantageous expressions he makes use of in speaking of the natural birth, in the twenty-fourth book of his work: several of which passages I have transcribed, or referred to; and to a passage in his thirtieth book, where he is professedly treating on the point of marriage. For, having said, as before shewn, that they did not compel, but only commended and exhorted to virginity, as the the catholics, he adds: 'And ^t indeed it ^{would} be no less than madness, for private persons to forbid ^{what} is allowed by public authority.' It seems therefore that, following their doctrine, they might have been disposed to prohibit marriage, if it had been in their power.

It is said that ^u the Manichees were severely treated by a king of Persia for discouraging marriage.

I may mention another thought relating to this point, when I come to speak of their notion concerning the transmigration of souls.

If the Manichees did not approve of marriage, they must have condemned fornication, and all such like irregularities. This

^r Neque enim iusta hæc nunc vestra sententia est, ut nos quidem, qui solum in plebe sacerdotale hominum genus censemus a carnibus abstinere debere, demoniorum doctrinæ videamur vobis assecutores. *ib. c. 1.* ^s See Beauf. T. 2, p. 470, &c. ^t Auditoribus autem vestris — secundum veniam hæc edenda conceditis. — Neque enim conceditur secundum veniam, nisi peccatum. Hoc vos de omni carniū cibo sentitis, hoc et ipsi — vestros auditores docetis: sed illis quod sit ignoscendum, propter quod vobis necessaria ministrant, ut dixi, conceditis, non dicentes non esse peccatum, sed peccantibus veni-

am largientes. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 30, c. 5.

^u Et demens profecto ille, non tantum stultus putandus est, qui id existimet lege privata prohiberi posse, quod sit publica concessum: dico autem hoc ipsum nubere. *ib. c. 4.* ^v Rex vero Persarum, cum vidisset tam Catholicos et episcopos, quam Manichæos Manetis sectarios, a nuptiis abstinere; in Manichæos quidem sententiam mortis tulit. Ad Christianos vero idem edictum manavit. — Quum igitur Christiani ad regem confugissent, iussit ille discrimen, quale inter utroque esset, sibi exponi. *ap. Aftem. Bib. Or. T. 3, p. 220.*

is evident from The Acts of Archelaus, where Mani himself is made to say that * adultery, fornication, covetousness, and other things, are fruits of the evil root. Nor is marriage here mentioned among evil things.

Augustine indeed charges them with allowing wicked sensual gratifications rather than marriage. But then, as ^y Beaufobre observes, he presently adds: ‘ I ^z doubt not but you, at hearing this, will exclaim against it as injustice and calumny. You will say that you praise and recommend perfect chastity, but you do not forbid marriage; forasmuch as you do not hinder your auditors, the second order among you, from marrying and having wives.’ It is not easy to conceive that ^a they, who severely censured the polygamy of the patriarchs, should approve of worse things in Christians.

XIII. It is a difficult question whether the Manichees believed free-will. It is generally denied; but Beaufobre does not concur in that sentence. He has discoursed largely upon this point, and I refer to ^b him. I shall however cite a part of what he says.

‘ If ^c by free-will be meant a power of doing good, and resisting evil, it is certain that the Manichees ascribed it to the soul, which was sent into matter. For, first, when we shewed the opinion of these men concerning the creation of the world; we saw that, among the souls which God sent to combat matter, there were some that preserved their purity entire; others that were but little affected with the contagion of matter; and others that were so corrupted, that they were left in this lower stage of the world. The Creator placed them according to their merits. Secondly, when Augustine asks Fortunatus why God sent souls into matter, that Manichee answers, to ^d tame it, and reduce it to order. They must therefore have had the power of so doing. Finally, what suffers me not to doubt that Mani acknowledged the soul’s liberty in it’s state of innocence,

* ——— fructus autem fornicationes, adulteria, homicidia, avaritia, et omnes mali actus male istius radice. ap Arch. c. 17, p. 30.

^y T. 2, p. 473.

^z Non enim concubitus, sed ut longe ante ab apostolo dictum est, vere nuptias prohibetis, quæ talis operis una est defensio. Hic non dubito vos esse clamatos, invidiamque facturos dicendo, castitatem perfectam vos vehementer commendare atque laudare, non tamen nuptias prohibere: quandoquidem auditores vestri, quorum apud vos secundus est gradus, ducere atque habere non prohiben-

tur uxores. De Mor. Manich. c. 18, n. 65.

^a Nec quod Jacob filius ejus inter Rachel et Liam duas germanas sorores, earumque singulas famulas, quatuor uxorum maritus, tamquam hircus erraverit: ut esset quotidie, inter quatuor scorta certamen, quænam eum venientem de agro prior ad concubitus raperet. Faust. l. 22, cap. 5.

^b T. 2, p. 433—448.

^c Ib. p. 438. ^d ——— et in contraria natura esse animam diximus, ideo ut contraria naturæ modum imponeret: modo imposito contrariæ naturæ, sumit eandem Deus. Fort. Disp. 2, n. 33. vid. et n. 34.

‘ is a passage in his letter to Menoch ; “ the ^e first soul that came from the God of light received the machine of the body to govern it with a rein.”

And, after a long discussion, that learned writer sums up all in these three ^f propositions : ‘ 1. The Manichees allowed the soul ‘ to be free in it’s origin, and its state of innocence. For it had ‘ power to resist evil, and to overcome it. 2. After it’s fall it ‘ had not absolutely lost that power, but it had lost the use, because it was ignorant of it’s nature, and its origin, and it’s true ‘ interests ; and because concupiscence, which has it’s seat in the ‘ flesh, carries it away by an invincible force to do or allow that ‘ which it condemns ; [or, in other words, the ^g soul has not lost ‘ it’s liberty, but ignorance on the one hand, and violence of ‘ passion on the other, hinder it from making use of it’s power.] ‘ 3. The gospel of Jesus Christ delivers the soul from that servitude, and gives it sufficient power to subdue sin, and to obey ‘ the law of God, provided it make use of the helps therein afforded.

After all which, Beausobre makes divers observations upon the controversy with the Manichees, as managed by ancient Christian authors, and then concludes in this manner : Finally, ‘ I ^h ‘ allow that those ancient writers in general say the Manichees ‘ denied free-will. The reason is, that the fathers believed and ‘ maintained against the Marcionites and Manichees, that whatever state man is in he has the command over his own actions, ‘ and has equally power to do good and evil. Augustine himself reasoned upon this principle, as well as other catholics his ‘ predecessors, so long as he had to do with the Manichees. ‘ But when he came to dispute with the Pelagians he changed ‘ his system. Then he denied that kind of freedom which before he had defended : and, so far as I am able to judge, his ‘ sentiment no longer differed from theirs concerning the servitude of the will. He ascribed that servitude to the corruption ‘ which original sin brought into our nature : whereas the Manichees ascribed it to an evil quality, eternally inherent in ‘ matter.’

XIV. Socrates said that ^k the Manichees held the doctrine of Fate. Whether, and how far, they did so may be seen in ^l Beausobre ; for I do not chuse to stay upon this point.

^e Operæ, inquit, pretium est advertere, quia prima anima, quæ a Deo luminis manavit, accepit fabricam istam corporis, ut eam freno suo regeret. Man. ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3. c. 186.

^f Ib. p. 447.

^h The same.

upon Augustine may be seen in the same author, p. 435—438.

377.

^g See p. 443.

ⁱ More observations

^k See before,

^l T. 2, p. 424—432.

XV. It is thought by some that ^m the Manichees denied the lawfulness of war.

XVI. Socrates informed us, that ⁿ the Manichees held the transmigration of souls; which is very true. It is taken notice of in ^o The Acts of Archelaus, ^p in Epiphanius, ^q Theodoret, and other authors.

Agapius, as abridged by Photius, says that ^r souls, which have arrived at the perfection of virtue, return to God: they that have been very wicked are assigned to fire and darkness; but others of a middle rank, which have behaved but indifferently, and are neither very good nor very bad, pass into other bodies.' That is only a summary account: if we had Agapius himself we should see more particulars.

A passage of Augustine may induce us to think it was their opinion, that ^s their elect needed no purification after this life: and likewise that their auditors in general, who were allowed to marry, trade, bear offices, and the like, passed into other bodies for purification, and farther trial.

The passage I have referred to is in Augustine's summary account of the Manichæan sect. There is another like passage ^t in his work against Faustus, which I also put into the margin.

And perhaps this may afford an argument, that marriage, and other things, practised by the auditors, were rather tolerated than approved in the Manichæan scheme: for which reason they who lived in that state would usually need to be purified, and to be put upon another trial in some other body.

XVII. It is easy to conclude, from what has been already said, that the Manichees did not believe the resurrection of the body. As Theodoret says, ^u they derided the resurrection of bodies. No part of matter, they said, could be worthy of salvation.'

^m See Beauf. T. 2, p. 797, and the authors quoted by him.

ⁿ See p. 377.

^o Arch. c. 9, p. 15. ^p H. 66, n. 28.

^q H. Fab. l. 1, c. 26, p. 214, A.

^r Κρατύνει δὲ καὶ τὰς μετεμψυχώσεως, τῆς μὲν εἰς ἀκρον ἀρετῆς ἐνδοξαίας, εἰς θεὸν ἀναλύνει· τῆς δὲ εἰς ἀκρον κακίας πυρὶ δίδας καὶ σκοτῶ· τῆς δὲ μεσῆς πῶς πολιτευσαμένης πάλιν εἰς σῶματα ἀγων. Phot. cod. 179, p. 105.

^s Animas auditorum suorum in electos revolvī arbitrantur, aut feliciore compendio in escas electorum suorum, ut iam inde purgata in nulla corpora revertantur. Ceteras autem animas et in pecora redire putant, et in omnia quæ radicibus fixa sunt, atque aluntur in terra. De H. c. 46.

^t Quid autem fallitis auditores vestros, qui cum suis uxoribus, et filiis, et familiis, et domibus, et agris vobis serviunt, si quisquis ista omnia non dimiserit, non accipit evangelium? sed quia eis non resurrectionem, sed revolutionem ad istam mortalitatem promittitis, ut rursus nascantur, et vita electorum vestrorum vivant, — aut si meliores meriti sunt, in melones et cucumeres, vel in alios aliquos cibos veniant, quos vos manducaturi estis, ut vestris ructatibus cito purgentur. &c. Contr. Faust. l. 5. c. x.

^u Τὴν δὲ σωματῶν ἀνάστασιν ὡς μὴδὲν ἐμβαλῆσθαι· ἡδὲν γὰρ τῆς γῆς μέρος ἐστὶν ὑπερλῆφαι σωτηρίας. Theod. H. F. l. i. cap. ult. p. 214, A.

According

According to them, Christ came to save souls. So their opinion is represented * in The Acts of Archelaus. Augustine's account in his book Of Heresies is, 'they' say that Christ came 'to save souls, not bodies.' Says Fortunatus, 'We² believe 'that Christ came to deliver the soul from death, and bring it 'back to eternal glory, and restore it to the Father.' Again, says the same Manichee, 'we² believe that our Saviour Christ 'came from heaven to fulfil the will of the Father: whose will 'is, that he should deliver our souls from the enmity by slaying it.'

Their notion about matter led them into this opinion: and they argued from ^b several texts of scripture, particularly from 1 Cor. xv. 50. *Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.*

They allowed a resurrection of the soul now; when, ^c being enlightened by the doctrine of the gospel, it purified itself from carnal affections. And they might speak of the resurrection or ^d ascent of the soul, when it should return to God; but they absolutely denied the resurrection of bodies.

Souls, when they have finished their purification here, return to the world of light, whence they came. But, which is somewhat strange, they pass by the way of the moon and the sun; which ^e by the Manichees were considered as ships or vessels of passage, by which souls return, and are conveyed to heaven.

According to them, the increase of the moon is caused by souls, or parts of light, ascending thither from the earth; and it's decrease by the departure of souls, which are thence transmitted to the sun. This appears absurd, and might be incredible, if it was not affirmed by ^f Augustine, ^g Archelaus, ^h Titus of Bostra, and ⁱ others.

* Επειμψε τον υιον αυτου τον ηγαπημενον εις ουτηναι λυχης. Ap. Arch. n. 8, p. 12.

² — eumque Christum novissimis temporibus venisse ad animas, non ad corpora liberanda. Aug. de H. c. 46.

² — ut eandem de morte liberaret, et perduceret eam ad aternam gloriam, et restitueret patri. Fortunat. Disp. i. n. 11.

² Quemadmodum et Salvatorem Christum credimus de coelo venisse, voluntatem Patris complere. Quae voluntas Patris haec erat, animas nostras de eadem inimicitia liberare, interfecta eadem inimicitia. Fortun. Disp. i. n. 17. Vid. et Disp. 2, n. 24.

^b Vid. Epiph. Hær. 6, c. 86, 87. et Aug. contr. Adim. c. 12, n. 4. et contr. Faust. l. xi. c. 3.

^c — qui dicitis nunc esse resurrectionem tantummodo animarum, per prædicationem veritatis: corporum autem, quam prædicaverunt apostoli, futuram negetis. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 4. c. 2. ^d Vid. Fortunat. Disp. i. n.

7, li. n. 33.

^e Quicquid vero undique purgatur luminis, per quasdam naves, quas esse lunam et solem volunt, regno Dei, tanquam propriis sedibus reddi. Aug. de Hær. c. 46, sub in. — quod delira imperitia Manichæi opinantes, repleri eam dicunt, sicut repletur navis, ex fugitiva Dei parte. — Hinc ergo impleri lunam dicunt, cum eadem pars Dei magnis laboribus ab inquinamento purgatur, de toto mundo — fugiens, redditur Deo — repleri vero per mensem dimidium, et alio dimidio in solem refundi, velut in aliam navem. Aug. Epist. 55, [al. 119] cap. 4, n. 7. ^f See the preceding note.

^g Ηλοια γαρ, ητοι πορθημια ειμαι λεγει της δυο φωνηας: ειτα εαν γεμισθη η σελήνη, μεταπορθημει εις απηλιωτην, κ. λ. Ap. Arch. n. 8, p. 13. ^h Tit. l. i. p. 69, in.

ⁱ Epiph. H. 66, n. 9, p. 626, B. C. Thdrt. T. 4, p. 213, C.

XVIII. The Manichees expected a future judgment, as ^k before shewn; and more passages might be alleged: Mani^l professeth it in The Acts of Archelaus.

But it is doubtful whether they believed the eternity of hell torments.

Mani, in the dispute with Archelaus, says that ‘all ^m sorts of souls will be saved, and the lost sheep will be brought back to the fold.’ A passage of the Epistle of the Foundation, preserved by the author De Fide, seems to speak ⁿ of some souls as lost, which shall be for ever excluded from the holy land, and the regions of light and happiness. They are such as have been enemies to the light, and have persecuted the church, and the elect therein.

Augustine seems to have supposed it to be their opinion that ^o some souls would finally perish. And, in his arguments with them, he often insists upon it as an undeniable thing, that ^p all the light that was mixed with darkness, or all the good or celestial substance that was sent into matter at the formation of the world, would never be again entirely separated from it; which he considers as a great objection against their scheme.

Simplicius likewise argues with them upon the supposition that ^q some parts of the good substance, or some souls, are for ever lost, and never again separated from the evil substance.

In

^k See p. 440. ^l Dicat tamen ipse, si est judicium piorum et impiorum. *Manes dixit*: Est judicium. Ap. Arch. n. 32, p. 54.

^m Et salvabitur omne animarum genus, ac restituetur quod perierat proprio suo gregi. Ap. Arch. c. 25, p. 41, 42.

ⁿ Item in epistola fundamenti sic dicit de illis animabus, quæ mundi amore errare se a priore lucida sua natura passæ sunt, — infesta etiam persecutione sua sanctam ecclesiam atque electos in eadem constitutos cœlestium præceptorum observatores afflixerunt, a beatitudine et gloria sanctæ terræ arcentur. Et quia a malo se superari passæ sunt, in eadem mala stirpe perseverabunt, pacifica illa terra et regionibus immortalibus sibi interdictis. De Fide cap. 5, ap. Aug. T. 8.

^o Ipsi enim dicunt, Deum genti tenebrarum æternum carcerem præparare, quam dicunt esse inimicam Deo. Et parum est, sed etiam sua membra simul cum ipsa gente puniendum esse non dubitant dicere. Contr. Adim. c. vii. n. 1. Dicunt enim etiam nonnullas animas, quas volunt esse de substantia Dei, et ejusdem omnino nature, quæ non sponte peccaverunt, sed a gente tenebrarum, quam mali

naturam dicunt, ad quam debellandum non ultro, sed Patris imperio descenderunt, superatæ et oppressæ sunt, affigi in æternum globo horribili tenebrarum. De Nat. Boni. c. 42. ^p Quarum inter se pugnam et commixtionem, et boni a malo purificationem, et boni quod purgari non poterit in æternum damnationem, secundum sua dogmata asseverantes, &c. Aug. de Har. c. 46, sub in. Deum denique bonum et verum dicunt cum tenebrarum gente pugnassee, et partem suam tenebrarum principibus miscuisse, eamque toto mundo inquinatam et ligatam per cibos Electorum suorum, ac per solem et lunam purgari asseverant. Et quod purgari de ipsa parte Dei non poterit, in fine sæculi æterno ac pœnali vinculo colligari. — Aug. Ep. 236, [al. 74.] Natura vero Dei captiva ducta est, iniqua facta est, nec potest totum purgari, cogitur in fine damnari. Contr. Secund. c. 20, sub fin. Nunc vero infelices audent adhuc dicere, nec totam posse purgari, et ipsam partem, quæ purgari non potuerit, proficere ad vinculum, — et affigatur in æternum carcere tenebrarum. De Agon. Christian. cap. iv. Opp. T. 6.

^q Αὐτὰς οὐκ ἐδεῖ ἐπιστρέφειν, ἐπὶ

In his summary account, Augustine represents it to be their opinion, that^r the dæmons shall in the end be buried alive in the hideous mass of darkness, and that some souls will be appointed to keep them fast shut up, and watch them as guards, and cover the kingdom of light from all attempts of the princes of darkness. He speaks to the like purpose^s elsewhere. Nor is this disagreeable to a passage of Mani's Epistle of the Foundation, as^t cited by the author De Fide.

All which however, as Beaufobre says, means no more than a privation of happiness, or a labour and task, rather than a punishment. Indeed, it is reasonable to think the^x Manichees should allow but very few, if any souls, to be lost and perish for ever. That could not be reckoned honourable to the Deity, considering how souls were sent into matter. The doctrine of transmigration may have been contrived for this purpose. The Manichees were very generous in this respect; they allowed souls no less than five^y bodies for trial.

XIX. The Manichees believed that after a certain period this^z visible world would be consumed by fire. But, as^a Turbo says in The Acts of Archelaus, he had not been informed how long it would be before that happened. However, Ebed-Jesu, quoted by^b Beaufobre, says, that^c according to the Manichees

φασιν, εις το αγαθον, αλλα μιν οσι τω κακω συγκεκολλημενοι. In Epiet. c. 34, p. 165. — δια το τινας, ως προτερον εμνησθη, ψυχας μινεν κατ' αυτης εν τω κακω τε λοιπη τον απειρον αιωνα. Ib. p. 166.

^r Sed a nobis sejunctam atque seclusam substantiam istam mali, et finito isto seculo post conflagrationem mundi in globo quodam, tamquam in carcere sempiterno, esse victuram. Cui globo affirmant accessurum semper et adhaesurum quasi coopertorium atque tectorium ex animabus, natura quidem bonis, sed tamen quæ non potuerint a naturæ malæ contagione mundari. De Hær. c. 46, in fin.

^s Dicat quod vult, includat in globo tamquam in carcere gentem tenebrarum, et forinsecus affigat naturam lucis, — ecce pejor est pœna lucis quam tenebrarum, pejor est pœna diviniæ naturæ quam gentis adversæ. Illa quippe, etsi in tenebris intus est, ad naturam ejus pertinet in tenebris habitare. Animæ autem quæ hoc sunt quod Deus, — a vita ac libertate sanctæ lucis alienantur, et configentur in prædicto horribili globo. De Nat. Bon. c. 42, sub fin. — suamque naturam bonam malo coercendo superandoque miscuisse, quam turpissime pollutam — labore magno vix mundet ac liberet, non totam tamen: sed

quod ejus non potuerit ab illa inquinatone purgari, tegmen ac vinculum futurum hostis victi et inclusi. De Civ. Dei l. xi. c. 22.

^t Non igitur poterunt recipi in regna pacifica, sed configentur in prædicto horribili globo, cui etiam necesse est custodiam adhiberi. Ap. libr. de Fide, c. 5. Conf. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 21, c. 16. et de Nat. Boni. cap. 42.

^u Ainsi la peine de ces ames n'est proprement qu'une privation de félicité, et un travail plutôt qu'une supplice. Beauf. T. 2, p. 574. ^x C'est un fait constant. Les Manichéens n'ont point cru la perte éternelle d'aucune ame. Ib. p. 572, in.

^y Ερω δε υμιν και τωτο, πως μεταγχιζεται η ψυχη εις πεντε σωματα. Ap. Arch. n. 9, in. Vid. et Epiph. H. 66, c. 28, in.

^z Vid. supr. not. r.

^a — αχρις αν το πυρ καταναλωση τον κοσμον ολον, εν ποσοις ποτε ιτιση, ανεκαμαθον την ποσοτητα Ap. Arch. c. xi. p. 22.

^b T. 2, p. 580. ^c Manichæi resurrectionem abnegantes contra Christianos jejunium luctumque in die dominico faciunt, aientes, in ipso die fore ut hoc seculum subeat interitum dissolutionemque omnem post circulum novem millium annorum. Ap. Assen. Bib. Or. Gr. T. 3, P. 2, p. 361.

the

the world would come to an end when it had subsisted nine thousand years.

XX. The Manichees were Christians, as was particularly^d shewn above. But they rejected the Old Testament, and pretended they^e could there see no prophecies about Christ, neither in Moses, nor in the other prophets. They therefore wanted that argument of faith in Jesus. As^f Faustus says, 'being Gentiles by nature, and not Jews, they came directly to Christ, 'excited by the fame of his virtues and wisdom.' He farther says, that 'they^g were induced to believe in Jesus for the sake 'of the voice of God, not speaking by a prophet or interpreter, 'but saying himself, when he sent his Son from heaven: *This is 'my beloved Son, hear him.*' 'We^h also believe his own word, 'who said: *I came forth from the Father, and came into the world:* 'and much more to the like purpose.' 'Moreoverⁱ he appeals 'to his works: *If ye believe not me, believe the works:* (Joh. x. 38.) 'He does not say, believe the prophets.' For such reasons then they believed in Jesus Christ, and received him as the Son of God, and their Lord and Saviour.

XXI. The Manichees believed Jesus Christ to be God, but not man. They believed him to be God truly, man in appearance only.

Turbo, once disciple of Mani, in The Acts of Archelaus, represents his master's opinion upon that head in this manner: 'The^k Son of God came and took the form of a man. He 'appeared to men as a man, though he was not a man, and 'they took him for a man born.'

In the same work Mani is brought in saying, that '^l Jesus 'appeared indeed in the form of a man, but yet was not a man.'

^d See p. 437. * Alioquin nihil eos de Christo prophetasse abunde jam parentum libris ostensum est. Faust. l. 12. Conf. l. 13, in.

Quia omnem, ut dixi, Moyses scripturam scrutatus, nullas ibi de Christo prophetias inveni. Id. l. 16, c. 3.

^f Quomodo Christum colitis, prophetas repudiantes, quorum ex præsagiis accipitur fuisse venturum? — Porro autem nos natura Gentiles sumus — non anti effecti Judæi, ut merito Hebræorum sequeremur fidem, euntes ad Christianismum; sed sola exciti fama, et virtutum opinione, atque sapientia liberatoris nostri Christi Jesu. Id. l. 13. ^g — quis fidelior vobis esset debet, quam Deus ipse de Filio suo, qui non per vatem, nec per interpretem,

sed ultro cœlitus erupta voce, cum eum mitteret ad terram dixit: Hic est Filius meus delectissimus: Credite illi. Id. l. 12.

^h Nec non et ipse de se: A Patre meo processi, et veni in hunc mundum; atque multa alia hujusmodi. Ib.

ⁱ Ad hæc et opera ipsa sua sibi in testimonium vocat: Si mihi non creditis, dicens, operibus credite. Non dixit, si mihi non creditis, prophetis credite. ibid.

^k Καὶ ἔθεν ο υἱος μετασχηματισὶν ἑαυτοῦ εἰς ἀνθρώπου εἶδος, καὶ ἔφανη τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὡς ἀνθρώπος, μὴ ὡς ἀνθρώπος, καὶ οἱ ἀνθρώποι ὑπελάμβανον αὐτοὺς γεννηθῆναι. Ap. Arch, c. 8, p. 12. ^l Sicut vos Jesus ostendit, eius qui apparuit quidem in hominis specie, nec tamen fuit homo. Ap. Arch. n. 47, p. 85.

Ancient catholic authors often take notice of this opinion of theirs, and represent it after this manner.

Augustine in his summary account of their principles says, 'they^m deny the real flesh of Christ, and affirm that he had only the appearance of flesh: and that neither his death nor his resurrection was real.' In another place, that 'theyⁿ believed not a real, but only a seeming imaginary death of Christ, and no nativity at all, not so much as in appearance.'

In another place Augustine says, 'they^o do not deny our Lord Jesus Christ to be God, but they pretend that he appeared to men without taking the human nature.'

Theodoret's account is, 'they^p say that Christ took neither soul nor body, but appeared as a man, though he had nothing human; and that his cross, passion, and death, were in appearance only.'

Athanasius says the^q Manichees deny that the Word was made flesh. Again, they^r do not believe our Lord's incarnation and humanity.

Ambrose says they^s did not believe that Christ came in the flesh.

Jerom speaks of^t their allowing the salvation of the soul only, and saying that both the birth and the resurrection of Christ were in appearance only: and therefore we cannot form an argument for the resurrection of our bodies from his resurrection, because he rose in appearance only.

So say the catholics. Let us now observe the Manichees themselves, that we may judge whether they have been misrepresented.

It is plain that, according to them, Jesus was pure deity. The

^m Nec fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus præbuisse, ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem similiter mentiretur. De H. c. 46.

ⁿ Cur ipsi mortem non veram, sed imaginariam Christi affirmant; nativitatem autem non saltem talem, sed prorsus nullam delegerunt? Contr. Faust. l. 29, c. 3.

^o — cum ipsi dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Deum esse non negent, et sine assumptione humani corporis eum hominibus apparuisse confugant. Aug. Sermon. 12. [al. de diversis 16.] cap. 8.

^p τὸν δὲ κύριον οὐτε ψυχὴν ἀνιῶνται φαίνεσθαι, οὔτε σῶμα, ἀλλὰ φαίνεσθαι ὡς ἀνθρώπον, καὶ εἶναι ἀνθρώπινον ἔχοντα καὶ τοὺς σαυροῦ αἰ, καὶ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τοὺς θανάτους, φαίνεται γινώσκειν. Thit. H. F. T. 4, p. 213, 214.

^q — ἀρνήνται τὸ, ὁ λόγος σαρκὶ ἐγένετο. Ath. Or. i. contr. Arian. p. 457, D.

^r Οὕτω δὲ μανχαιοὶ ἀπιστήσαντες τῇ σαρκώσει καὶ ἐνανθρώπησιν τοῦ κυρίου. Contr. Apoll. l. i. p. 939, D.

^s — Cum Manichæus adoraverit, quem in carne venisse non credidit. Ambr. de Fid. l. 5, c. 14, T. 2, p. 583, E.

^t Hæreticos vero, in quorum parte sunt Marcion, Apelles, Valentinus, Manes, nomen infantiæ, penitus et carnis et corporis resurrectionem negare, et salutem tantum tribuere animæ; frustra quoque nos dicere ad exemplum Domini resurrecturos, quum ipse quoque Dominus in phantasmate surrexerit; et non solum resurrectio ejus, sed et ipsa nativitas τῷ δοκεῖν, id est, putative visa magis sit quam fuerit. Hier. ad Pamm. Ep. 38, [al. 61.] T. 4, p. 320, m.

catholics argued that Christ had been foretold in the books of Moses, particularly in Deut. xviii. 18. *I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee: him shall ye hear.*

How does Faustus answer that argument? It is in this manner:

‘That ^a this does not belong to Christ, any one may see: for
 ‘Christ is not a prophet, nor a prophet like unto Moses. Moses
 ‘was a man, Christ is God. He was a sinner, Christ holy. He
 ‘was born in the ordinary way; Christ, according to you was
 ‘born of a virgin, according to me not at all.—How then can
 ‘he be a prophet like unto Moses?’

Faustus often denies Christ’s ^{*} nativity: and again and again insists upon the impropriety that ^y God, and the God of the Christians too, should be born.

They pretended that it was dishonourable for Christ to be born of a woman. ^{*} This argument is taken notice of in The Acts of ^z Archelaus.

It is easy to suppose that the catholic Christians put these people in mind of those texts of the New Testament, where ^a Jesus is said to be the son of David, of the seed of David, according to the flesh, and the like: to which, however, they gave answers, such as they are.

The Manichees argued from the first chapter of St. John’s gospel, ver. 5. *And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.* The light is the Word, or the divine nature: the darkness, according to them, is the flesh, or matter, the evil substance. The light shined in the darkness, but the darkness could not touch, seize, lay hold of the light: nor indeed would the light touch the darkness, or suffer itself to be touched by it. This thought is in a fragment of one of Mani’s ^b letters.

^a — Sed hoc quidem ad Christum minime spectare, nec Judaeum latet, nec nobis sic credere conducibile est: quia non propheta Christus, nec Moysi similis propheta: siquidem ille fuerit homo, hic Deus; ille peccator, hic sanctus; ille ex coitu natus, hic secundum te ex virgine, secundum me vero nec ex virgine. Faust. l. 16. c. 4. ^{*} Accipis evangelium? Et maxime. Proinde ergo et natum accipis Christum? Non ita est. Neque enim sequitur, ut si evangelium accipio, ideo et natum accipiam Christum. Faust. l. 2, in.

^y Accipis ergo generationem? Equidem conatus diu sum hoc ipsum quaecunque est persuadere mihi, quia sit natus Deus. — Quamvis nec sic quidem dignum erit ex utero natum credere Deum, et Deum Christianorum. Id. l. 3. in. et fin.

Sed non, inquit, accipere evangelium hoc solum est, si quod praecepit facias: sed

ut etiam credas omnibus quae in eodem scripta sunt, quorum primum est illud, quia sit natus Deus. Id. l. 5, c. 2.

^z Ergo non putas, eum ex Maria virgine esse? *Manes dixit:* Absit, ut Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum per naturalia pudenda mulieris descendisse confiteor. ap. Arch. c. 47, p. 85. Vid. et cap. 5, p. 8. ^a Apostolum accipis? Et maxime. Cur ergo non credis Filium Dei, ex semine David, natum secundum carnem? — Faust. l. xi. in.

^b Μία τῆ φωτός ἐστὶν ἀπλὴ καὶ ἀληθὴς ἡ φύσις, καὶ μία αὐτῆς ἡ ἐνεργεῖα· τὸ φῶς γὰρ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐκ ἐλάβεν· ὁ γὰρ νοσίας ὑψάτο σαρκὸς, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ὁμοιωμάτι καὶ σχήματι σαρκὸς ἐκκίασθη, ὥστε μὴ κρατήσῃ διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, καὶ παθῇ, καὶ φθάρῃ, τῆς σκοτίας ὀβρισιμῶς αὐτῆς τῆς ἐνεργείας τῆς φωτὸς. Manet. Ep. Zebeu. ap. Fabric. B. Gr. T. v. p. 284.

And

p. 279.

And this leads us to think that this notion was chiefly owing to their doctrine of two principles. Believing matter, of which the body is formed, to be evil in itself, they could not allow a divine person to be united to the human nature; and ^c therefore they pretended that our Lord had only the appearance of flesh without the reality.

They said that ^d Christ came directly from heaven. They argued this from all those texts where ^e our Lord speaks of his coming from the Father, being sent by the Father, and the like.

They argued likewise that our Lord was not born of a woman, because ^f when some weak people, as they call them, told him his mother and his brethren stood without, he answered, *Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?* Matth. xii. 47, 48. This text was often insisted on by them; and their argument is handsomely answered by ^g Jerom. Indeed, any men, not under the bias of some prejudice, might perceive that our Lord does not here disown any earthly relations; but, preserving a due affection for them, he declares that he considered every truly good man and woman as his mother, his brother, and sister; that is, all such were dear to him. And he teaches us not to suffer ourselves to be diverted from any important service by the unseasonable importunities of earthly friends and relatives. Augustine observes they ^h might as well argue that the disciples had no earthly fathers, because Christ says to them: *Call no man your father upon earth, for one is your Father which is in heaven:* Matt. xxiii. 9.

As they were greatly pressed by the catholic argument from the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, they endeavoured to evade it many ways. Sometimes they disputed ⁱ the genuineness

^c See Beauf. T. i. p. 378.

^d Mihi enim pium videtur dicere, quod nihil eguerit filius Dei, in eo quod adventus ejus procuratur ad terras, neque opus habuerit columba, neque baptisinate, neque matre, neque fratribus, fortasse neque patre, qui ei secundum te fuit Iosephus; sed totus ille ipse descendens, &c. Manes ap. Arch. c. 50, p. 91.

^e Ipse enim testimonium dat, quia de sinibus Patris descendit. Et, qui me recipit, recepit eum qui me misit. Et, non veni facere voluntatem meam, sed ejus qui misit me. Et, non sum missus nisi ad oves perditas Israel. Sunt et alia innumera testimonia hujuscemodi, quæ indicant eum venisse, non natum esse. ap. Arch. c. 47, p. 85.

^f Manes dixit: Similis tui quidam, cum ei aliquando dixisset, *Maria mater tua*, et fratres tui foris stant, non libenter accipiens, eum qui dixerat, increpavit, dicens:

Quæ est mater mea, aut qui sunt fratres mei? et ostendit eos, qui facerent voluntatem suam, et matres sibi esse et fratres. ap. Arch. ib. p. 85.

^g Non ergo juxta Marcionem et Manichæum matrem negavit, ut natus de phantasmate putaretur; sed apostolos cognationi prætulit, ut et nos in comparatione dilectionis carni spiritum præferamus. In Matt. T. 4, p. 52, f.

^h Cujus rei exemplum præbuit prior ipse dicendo: Quæ mihi mater, aut qui fratres? Unde volunt quidam perniciosissimi hæretici asserere, non eum habuisse matrem. Nec vident esse consequens, si hæc verba attendant, ut nec discipuli ejus patres habuerint: quia sicut ipse dixit, quæ mihi mater est; sic illos docuit, cum ait: Nolite vobis dicere patrem in terris. Enarr. in Ps. ix. n. 31. T. 4.

ⁱ Vid. Faust. l. 2, et 7.

of those genealogies, and ^k they insisted upon the differences and seeming contrarieties in them, as recorded by those two evangelists. They likewise argued that ^l they were contrary to all those declarations of Christ, where he disowned all earthly kindred, and said he came from heaven, and was not of this world.

They argued from Christ's escape from the Jews, when they would have stoned him: see John viii. 59. This argument is in Mani himself: 'By ^m that escape,' he says, 'Christ shewed his essence, and that he was the Son of the true light: he went away from them without being seen. The immaterial form was not visible, nor tangible, though there was the appearance of flesh. For what is material can have no communion with an immaterial substance, though this appear in the form of flesh.' It is likely that ⁿ here is a reference to those words of St. Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 14: *What communion hath light with darkness?*

They argued from our Lord's transfiguration. Mani himself in a fragment says: 'The ^o Son of the eternal light manifested his nature on the mount.'

In another fragment ^p Mani banters the Galileans, as he calls them, for believing two natures in Christ, not considering that the nature of light cannot be mixed with matter: 'For it is simple and uncompounded, and cannot be joined to matter. The supreme light, being among material things, shewed a body, whilst still it was one nature only.'

These, and such like arguments, had great influence upon Augustine's mind for a long time, as ^q he humbly owns.

Farther, we find Faustus arguing from ^r our Saviour's escape

^k Vid. eund. l. 3. ^l Quare non credis in genealogiam Jesu? Multae quidem sunt causae. Sed palmaris illa, quia nec ipse ore suo usquam se fatetur patrem habere, aut genus in terra, sed e contra, quia non sit de hoc mundo, quia a Patre Deo processerit, quia descenderit de caelo, quia non sibi sint mater et fratres, nisi qui fecerint voluntatem Patris sui qui in caelis est. Faust. l. 7.

^m Ιουδαίων βλομενών ποτε λυβασαι τον χριστον, — ιδειξε σαφως την αυτην ησαν ο τη ανωτατη φωτος υιος, και μεσος αυτων διελθων ηχ υρατο η γαρ αυλος μορφη συσχηματισαμενη το ειδος της σαρκος, ορατη μιν ηκ ην, εψηλαφειτο δε υδαμως, δια το μηδεμιαν εχειν κοινησαν την ιδαν προς το αυλον, ει και σαρκος υρατο μορφη. Man. Ep. ad Cudar. ap. Fabr. ib. p. 285.

ⁿ See Beauf. T. 2, p. 530.

^o ο δε τη αιδια φωτος υιος την ιδαν ησαν εις την ορατην εμφανισεν. ap. Fabr. B. Gr. T.

5, p. 285.

^p Των γαλιλαιων δυο φυσικς απομαζοντων εχειν τον χριστον, πλατυν κατασχεομεν γελητα — το δε ανωτατον φως της εαυτη συνωσισημενον ιδειξεν εαυτον εις τους υλικους σωμασι σωμα, μια ων αυτος φυσικς το παν. ap. Fabr. ib.

^q Ipsum quoque salvatorem nostrum unigenitum tuum, tamquam de massa lucidissimae molis tuae porrectum ad nostram salutem, ita putabam. — Talem itaque naturam ejus nasci non posse de Maria virgine arbitrabar, nisi carni concerneretur. Concerni enim et non inquinari non videbam, quod mihi tale figurabam. Metuebam itaque credere in carne natum, ne credere cogerer ex carne inquinatum. Confess. l. 5, c. xi. n. 20.

^r Legitur id quoque, quod de supercilio montis jactatus aliquando a Judaeis, illatus abierit. &c. Faust. l. 26, c. 2.

at Nazareth, when the people would have cast him down from the brow of the hill; or, as he says, when they did so, and yet he escaped.

And to prove that Jesus was man in appearance only, they^a referred to those words in Philip. ii. 8. *And was found in fashion as a man.*

Whereas it was objected to them that^t if Jesus had not been born, and had not an human body, he could not have been seen or heard by men: they answered that angels had been seen, and had conversed with men, though they had not human bodies.

XXII. As the Manichees did not believe that Christ was born, or had true body, so neither did they believe that he was really crucified, or that he died. They did not deny^u that he was apprehended by the Jews, and, so far as in them lay, fastened to the cross, and that he seemed to die: but they did not allow that he really died.

So Faustus says without any hesitation or ambiguity: 'We^x own that he suffered in appearance, but he did not really die.' Again: 'It^z is our opinion that Jesus did not die.' He likewise says: 'As^a from the beginning, having taken the likeness of man, he appeared to have all the infirmities of the human state; so, at the conclusion of his transaction here, it was not improper that he should seem to die.'

Mani himself in his fragment says: 'A^b simple nature does not die, nor is an appearance of flesh crucified.' And^c more to the like purpose.

Augustine^d passeth a just censure upon their notion of a seeming death, and an imaginary, deceitful resurrection.

Nevertheless they often speak^e of Christ's being made subject

I i 3

to

^a Sed totus ille ipse descendens semetipsum in quocumque voluit transformavit in hominem, eo pacto quo Paulus dicit, quia habitu repertus est ut homo. ap. Arch. n. 50, p. 91.

^t Nam illud quidem quod saepe affirmare soletis, necessario eum esse natum, quia alias hominibus videri aut loqui non posset, ridiculum est: cum multoties, ut jam probatum a nostris est, angeli, et visi hominibus et locuti esse monstrantur. Faust. l. 29, c. i. f.

^u See Beauf. T. i. p. 228, 229.

^x Denique nos specie tenus passum confitemur, nec vere mortuum. Faust. l. 29. c. i.

^z Alioquin nobis nec Jesus mortuus est, nec est immortalis Elias. Id. l. 26, c. 2, f.

^a Ut enim ab initio sumta hominis similitudine omnes humanæ conditionis simulavit affectus, sic ab re non erat, si in fine

quoque consignandæ æconomix gratia fuisset visus et mori. Id. l. 26, c. i. f.

^b Ἀπλὴ φύσις ἢ ἀποθήκη, καὶ σκία σαρκὸς ἢ γαυρηται. Manes ap. Fabr. T. 5, p. 284.

^c Πῶς ἢ ἐπαθε, μὴτε τῆς κακίας κρατῆμενης, μὴτε τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῆς σκοτισθείσης; Id. ibid.

^d Sed illud est quod magis simile dicimini asserere, quod passionem mortemque ejus specie tenus factam, et fallaciter dicitis adumbratam, ut mori videretur, qui non moriebatur. Ex quo fit, ut ejus quoque resurrectionem umbraticam, imaginariam, fallacemque dicatis: neque enim ejus, qui non vere mortuus est, vera resurrectio esse potest. Ita fit, ut et cicatrices discipulis dubitantibus falsas ostenderit. &c. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 29, c. 2.

^e Hoc ergo sentimus de nobis quod et de Christo, qui cum in forma

to death, buried, and raised from the dead by the power of the Father. They believed that^f for our salvation Christ hung upon the cross. And therefore Faustus pretends to be excessively angry with Moses for that saying: *Curfed is every one that hangeth on a tree*: Deut. xxi. 23. They likewise speak^g of our Lord's shewing the marks of his wounds for curing the unbelief of Thomas.

As the Manichees did not believe Christ to have been born, nor to have a real body, they denied his baptism, and some other facts related in the gospels. For proof of this, and likewise for farther shewing their opinion concerning our Lord's crucifixion, I shall here produce part of a passage of Faustus, which must be alleged hereafter upon another account more at large.

'We^h reject divers other things which have been since added to the history of Christ; as that he was born of a woman, circumcised like a Jew, that he sacrificed like a heathen, that he debased himself so unworthily as to be baptized, and was then carried into the wilderness, and miserably tempted of the devil. Excepting these things, and the quotations of the Old Testament, which have been clandestinely inserted, we believe all the rest, and especially his mystic crucifixion, by which he discovers to us the wounds of our soul.'

These things need no answer. It would be waste of time to stay to confute what any one may presently perceive to be weak and absurd. I shall however add a word or two by way of explanation.

In what is said of Christ's sacrificing, perhaps he refers to our Lord's keeping the passover, and to the offering made by Mary for her purification: see Luke ii. 24.

As they paid no regard to the institutions of Moses, and denied our Lord to be born, or to have real flesh, it is no wonder that they excepted against the things just mentioned, and to his circumcision.

forma Dei esset constitutus, factus est subditus usque ad mortem, ut similitudinem animarum nostrarum ostenderet. Et quemadmodum in se mortis similitudinem ostendit, et se a Patre esse de medio mortuorum resuscitatum: eo modo sentimus et de animis nostris futurum, quod per ipsum poterimus ab hac morte liberari. Fortun. Disp. i. n. 7.

^f Quapropter et nos Moysen, — plus tamen hinc execramur, quod Christum filium Dei, qui nostrae salutis causa pependit in ligno diro devotionis convitio laceravit. — Ait enim maledictum esse omnem qui pendet in ligno. Faust.

l. 14. c. i. in. § — cum Christus Thomam apostolum dubitantem de se aspernatus non sit, sed quo animi ejus vulneribus mederetur, corporis sui cicatrices ostendit. Faust. l. 16, c. 8.

^h Dico autem hoc ipsum natum ex femina turpiter, circumcisum judaice, sacrificasse gentiliter, baptizatum humiliter, circumductum a diabolo per desertum, et ab eo tentatum quam miserrime. His igitur exceptis, et — credimus cetera, praeclue crucis ejus mysticam fixationem, qua nostrae animae passionis monstrantur vulnera. Faust. l. 32, c. 7.

In The Acts of Archelaus, Mani is represented ⁱ excepting against the account of Christ's baptism, because that ordinance signified remission of sins, whereas Jesus was free from sin. But there is no just ground for that exception in the history of our Lord's baptism, as recorded by the evangelists.

As for their denying Christ's temptation, undoubtedly that is a consequence of their supposition that Christ was God and not man.

As for the mystic, figurative crucifixion, it is likely that the passages above transcribed may be of use to enable the reader to form some notion of their meaning. I likewise refer ^k to Beausobre.

Faustus does elsewhere speak of a ^l passible Jesus. And ^m Secundinus has somewhat to the like purpose: but the meaning is not obvious. I apprehend that if we had Agapius, or more of Mani's works, we might understand this, and some other things, better than we do.

Before I quit this article, I chuse to put down some observations of Beausobre which may afford useful illustrations.

'The grace of the Saviour,' says ⁿ he briefly, 'consists in enabling the soul to understand it's nature, it's origin, it's duties, it's hopes, and in giving it necessary assistances for breaking the chains of carnal passions.' In other places more largely: 'The ^o grace of Jesus Christ has several branches: but the principal is the giving the soul the knowledge of it's nature and origin, which it had in a manner lost since it's union with matter. Another branch is discovering to the soul the snares of the devil, the means of escaping them, and of returning to it's heavenly country. This is what Fortunatus says to Augustine: "As ^p we sin unwillingly, and are compelled by the substance which is ^q adverse and contrary to us, we endeavour to gain the knowledge

ⁱ Manes dixit: Ergo baptisma propter remissionem peccatorum datur? Archelaus dixit: Etiam. Manes dixit: Ergo peccavit Christus, quia baptizatus est; Archelaus dixit: Absit. *ap. Arch. c. 50, p. 94.*

^k See him T. 2, p. 546.

^l Necnon et Spiritus Sancti, — aeris hunc omnem ambitum sedem fatemur ac diverforium: cujus ex viribus ac spiritali profusione, terram quoque concipientem, gignere patibilem Jesum, qui est vita ac salus hominum, omni suspensus ex ligno. Faust. l. 20, c. 2.

^m — noli esse erroris lancea, qua latus percutitur Salvatoris. Vides enim illum et in omni mundo et in omni anima crucifixum, quæ anima nunquam habuit succensendi naturam.

Secundin. ad Aug. n. 3.

T. i. p. 569, in.

^o T. 2. p. 548, 549. See also p. 546, 547.

^p Nam quia inviti peccamus, et cogimur a contraria et inimica nobis substantia, idcirco sequimur scientiam rerum. Qua scientia admonita anima, et memorie pristinae reddita, recognoscit ex quo originem trahat, in quo malo versetur, quibus bonis iterum emendans quod nolens peccavit, possit per emendationem delictorum suorum, bonorum operum gratia, meritum, sibi reconciliationis apud Deum collocare, auctore Salvatore nostro, qui nos docet et bona exercere, et mala fugere. Fortunat. *Diap. 2. n. 20.*

ⁿ Beauf.

^o T. 2. p. 548,

“ of things. By this knowledge the soul, recovering it's first
 “ ideas, comes to understand it's original, and it's present misery.
 “ Then correcting it's past faults, and practising good works, it
 “ obtains reconciliation with God, under the conduct of our Sa-
 “ viour, who teaches both what good things we should do, and
 “ what evil things we should avoid.” ‘And, as Fortunatus after-
 “ wards adds: “It is clear therefore, that repentance is given
 “ the soul since the coming of the Saviour, and since this know-
 “ ledge of things; by which, being washed, as in a divine foun-
 “ tain, and purified from the vices and defilements of the world,
 “ which it had contracted in the body, it may be restored to the
 “ kingdom of God whence it came.”

XXIII. And now, since the Manichees denied that Christ really suffered, we are led to observe still more distinctly whether they thought his death to have the nature of a sacrifice, or what ends and uses his seeming death answered. Beausobre, who has written their history with great care, and nicely examined their opinions, speaks to this point more than once; and his words are very remarkable.

‘The Manichees,’ says he, ‘had no temples, for they had
 ‘no idols.—Nor had they any altars, because they had no sa-
 ‘crifice, no not that which the ancient church called the sacrifice
 ‘of commemoration. For they did not believe that Jesus Christ
 ‘really suffered, nor consequently that his death was a true sacri-
 ‘fice. The eucharist with them was only a ceremony of thank-
 ‘giving in memory of the mystic crucifixion of our Saviour.
 ‘That crucifixion, according to them, had only moral views.’

Again: ‘The Manichees, as they ascribed little to faith,
 ‘ascribed a great deal to good works, which they considered as
 ‘an essential and absolutely necessary condition of salvation.
 ‘They had not the same notion of the death of Christ that we
 ‘have. According to us, it is an offering made to God for the
 ‘expiation of the sins of men: according to them, it is only an
 ‘act of sublime virtue, the end of which is, on the one hand,
 ‘to teach men not to fear death, and to crucify the flesh; and on
 ‘the other hand to assure them of the immortality, of which
 ‘Christ has given them a pattern in his resurrection.’

And, after quoting the passages of Fortunatus transcribed

¶ Unde patet recte esse poenitentiam da-
 tam post adventum salvatoris, et post hanc
 scientiam rerum, qua possit anima, ac si
 divino fonte lota, de sordibus et vitiis tam
 mundi totius, quam corporum in quibus

eadem anima versatur, regno Dei, unde
 progressa est, representari. ib. n. 21.

¶ T. 2, p. 703, 704.

¶ ibid. p. 794, m.

¶ See more to
 the same purpose, ib. p. 546.

above,

above^u, the same learned author says: 'It^x hence appears that the Manichees ascribed the salvation of the soul to the doctrine of the Saviour. They could not ascribe it in any manner to the virtue of his blood, or of his sacrifice; forasmuch as they did not believe that he had blood, or that he made himself a sacrifice. All the efficacy of the ministry of Christ consisted in the power of his doctrine, supported by his miracles.' He then adds, 'he cannot certainly say how they explained those texts of scripture which speak of our being redeemed by the blood of Christ: but perhaps they thereby meant his doctrine, an explication which he has met with in so ancient and venerable a writer as y Clement of Alexandria.'

SECT. V. Their worship.

I. *Its simplicity.* II. *Their public worship; prayers, reading the scriptures, with discourses.* III. *Their baptism, and eucharist.* IV. *They observed the Lord's-day: V. And Easter, and Pentecost, and the anniversary of Mani's martyrdom.* VI. *Their discipline.*

I. It is now proper to take some notice of their worship.

Here a fine passage of Faustus offers itself. He is shewing the difference between his sect and heathens: 'They^a think that God is to be worshipped with altars, victims, chapels, images, incense. I, if I might be worthy, would esteem myself a reasonable temple of God. Christ, his son, I receive as a living image of the living God. His altar is my mind, cultivated with care, and endowed with knowledge and just sentiments. The honours and sacrifices which I present to the Deity, are prayers, and those pure and simple.'

So Faustus. And Beausobre supposeth that^b their worship was generally simple and plain, like that of a sect that arose and

^u See notes p and q.

^x Beauf. T.

^y *Et sanguis filii ejus mundat nos.*] Doctrina quippe Domini, quæ valde fortis est, sanguis ejus appellata est. Clem. Adumbr. in Ep. i. Joan. p. 1009. ed. Pott. Ἀγοράζει δὲ ἡμᾶς κυρίου τιμὴ αἱμάτων, δισποτῶν πάσαι τῶν πικρῶν ἀπαλλασσῶν ἀμαρτιῶν, δι' αὗς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πομπῆς ἐκνέμουν ἡμῶν. Id. in Ecl. p. 994, n. 20.

^z Item Pagani aris, delubris, simulachris, victimis, atque incenso Deum colendum putant. Ego ab his in hoc quoque multum diversus incedo, qui ipsum me, si mo-

do sum dignus, rationabile Dei templum puto. Vivum vivæ majestatis simulachrum Christum Filium ejus accipio: aram, mentem bonis artibus et disciplinis imbutam. Honores quoque divinos ac sacrificia in solis orationibus, et ipsis puris ac simplicibus, pono. Faust. l. 20, c. 3.

^b A l'égard de la pompe, je ne suis point surpris, qu'il n'y en eût pas dans la fête d'une secte, séparée de l'église dès le iii. siècle, lorsque le culte étoit encore assez simple, et qui étoit persécutée par-tout. T. 2, p. 711, in. See him also, p. 700—705.

separated

separated from the catholics in the third century, and was always persecuted.

II. They had public worship where ^c prayers were performed, at which all were present, auditors as well as elect: for Augustine, who never entered into the higher order, was present at them.

Prayer was a religious exercise in which they were often engaged, either publicly or privately, both by night and by day. This may be argued from what Augustine ^d said of the different points of the heavens, to which they turned themselves in praying, whether in the day time or night season: not now to mention any other proofs of this.

They read the scriptures in their public assemblies. I suppose this may be inferred from a passage of Augustine, where ^e he speaks of their admiring and reading the epistles of the apostles: and from another place, where ^f he speaks of their reading, commending and respecting the epistles of the apostle Paul; of which they gave wrong interpretations, and thereby deceived many.

Mani's Epistle of the Foundation ^g was read in their assemblies, as ^h divers pieces, beside canonical scripture, were often read among other ancient Christians.

It is likely that they also had discourses, explaining the principles of religion, and exhorting to the practice of virtue. For whilst Augustine was among them, he observed that ⁱ they earnestly warned men against sensuality, ambition, and such other faults.

III. They observed the Christian appointments of baptism and the eucharist. Felix, in his dispute with Augustine, mentions ^k both these ordinances, as usual among them.

They practised infant baptism. This appears both from ^l Faustus and ^m Mani himself. They both speak of it as common among Christians; and they shew their approbation of it.

They

^c Nosti autem me non Electum vestrum, sed Auditorem fuisse. Itaque quamvis et orationi vestrae interfuerim, ut interrogatis, &c. Disp. contr. Fortun. i. n. 3.

^d See before, p. 460. ^e Et tamen epistolas apostolorum, quibus haec omnia contestantur, tenetis, legitis, praedicatis. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 12. c. 24.

^f Certe et ipsi Manichaei legunt apostolum Paulum, et laudant et honorant, et ejus epistolas male interpretando multos decipiunt. Id. de Genesi l. i. c. 2, n. 3.

^g Ipsa enim nobis illo tempore miseris quando lecta est, illuminati dicebamur a

vobis. Contr. Ep. Fund. c. v. n. 6.

^h See Vol. ii. of this work, p. 26, 27, 50.

ⁱ Neque hoc eorum doctrinae tribuo: fateor enim et illos sedulo monere, ut ista caveantur. De Ut. Cred. c. i. n. 3.

^k Si adversarius nullus contra Deum est, ut quid baptizati sumus? ut quid eucharistia? ut quid Christianitas, si contra Deum nihil est? Act. cum. Fel. c. 19. ap. Aug. T. 8.

^l Unde etiam omnis religio, et maxime Christiana, ad sacramentum rudes infantes appellat. Faust. l. 24. c. 1.

^m Qui his verbis mihi interrogandi sunt: Si omne malum actuale est, antequam ma-

They baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as we learn from ^a Athanasius.

Jerom^o speaks of the Manichæan baptism.

I only add, Augustine says that ^p the Manichees, in that respect differing from the Pelagians, say infants have need of a Saviour on account of the corruption which the sin of the first man transmits unto them.

They had the eucharist frequently, as ^q Augustine knew very well, though he never was present at it.

They communicated in both kinds. As much may be inferred from the infamous story of their eucharist, formerly taken notice of. But, as the elect might not drink wine, it ^r is doubtful what liquor they made use of; whether pure water, or water with raisins, or somewhat else, steeped in it. Beaufobre is inclined to think that ^s they made use of pure water; therein following the example of some other sects more ancient than themselves. So it may be; I do not deny it. But I almost wonder that Beaufobre did not here recollect what Augustine writes of the diet of the elect, which he himself also has given a distinct account of ^t elsewhere. For, if Augustine may be relied upon, and has been guilty of no misrepresentation, the ^u elect, though forbidden the use of wine, did sometimes drink beer, cyder, and a sort of boiled wine, or liquor resembling wine.

In the time of pope Leo, called the great, the people of this sect at Rome, the better to conceal themselves and avoid the severity of the laws, communicated with the catholics.. They ^x received the bread, but they avoided the cup as much as possible; because, as I suppose, they scrupled to taste wine.

IV. The

lum quispiam agat, quare accipit purificationem aquæ, cum nullum malum egerit per se? Aut si nec dum egit, et purificandus est, licet [al. liquet,] eos naturaliter malæ stirpis pullulationem ostendere. Manet. Ep. ap. Aug. op. Imp. l. 3, c. 187.

^a Οὗτω μανχαιοί, καὶ Φρυγίαι, καὶ οἱ τῆ παροισατίας μαθηταί, τὰ νοήματα λεγόντες, εὖ οὐκ ἔπρεον εἰς αἰρετικούς. Or. 2, contr. Ar. n. 43, p. 510. E.

^o Diaconus eras, — et a Manichæis baptizatos recipiebas. Hier. contr. Lucifer. T. 4. P. 2, p. 305, m.

^p — quod non vult Manichæus; ut tamen propter vitium, quod in eos per peccatum primi hominis pertransiit, fateatur et parvulus necessarium salvatorem, quod non vult Pelagius. Contr. duas Ep. Pelag. c. 4, n. 3. T. 10.

^q Nam et eucharistiam audiui a vobis sæpe quod accipiatis. Tempus autem cum

me lateret, quid accipiatis, unde nosse potui? Contr. Fort. Disp. i. n. 3.

^r B. T. 2. p. 721.

^s ib. p. 723.

^t ib. 774, 775.

^u — bibat

autem mulsam, carœnum passum, et nonnullorum pomorum expressos succos, vini speciem satis imitantes. — de Mor. Manich. c. 13, n. 29. Hordei quidam succo vinum imitantur, quod movendo fit optimum. Sane, quod minime prætereundum est, hoc genus potus citissime inebriat. Nec tamen unquam succum hordei fel principum esse dixistis. id. cap. 16, n. 46. — et carœnum quod bibitis, nihil aliud quam coctum vinum esse videamus. ib. n. 47. Conf. c. 13, n. 30.

^x Cumque ad tegendam infidelitatem suam nostris audent interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant. Ore indigno corpus Christi accipiunt,

IV. The Manichees observed the Lord's day, but fasted upon it, auditors as well as elect. This is taken notice of by ¹ Augustine, ² Ambrose, ³ Leo, just quoted. Ebedjesu, cited by Asséman, gives this reason of that practice: 'They ^b expected the coming of Christ on that day.' Which leads Beaufobre to say, they then meditated upon the last coming of Christ, at the end of this inferior world which we inhabit. Supposing that the conflagration and dissolution of our earth would happen on a Lord's-day, and not knowing which, they ever passed that day in fasting and prayer, that the Lord, when he came, might find them in the exercise of humiliation and repentance.

V. The Manichees, or however those of Africa, kept Easter, as we learn from ^d Augustine; who only blames them that they did not keep it with sufficient solemnity.

Beaufobre supposes that ^e there is no good reason to doubt of their keeping the feast of Pentecost.

In the ^f month of March, and therefore usually about the time of Easter, they celebrated the anniversary of the martyrdom of Mani, which was called Bema, or the master's chair.

VI. Their ecclesiastical constitution we saw ^g formerly, in the passage of Augustine concerning their elect and auditors.

It is likely they had also some ecclesiastical discipline, and that censures of their church were pronounced upon bad livers. This is supposed in a story told by Augustine of an indecency committed by some of the elect, whilst he was of that sect. He says, that ^h he and others were offended, and expected that the men should have been excommunicated, or at least sharply reprov'd; but,

piunt, sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Leo. Sermon. 4. de Quadragesima.

^y Die autem Dominico jejunare scandalum est magnum, maxime posteaquam innotuit detestabilis — hæresis Manichæorum, qui suis auditoribus ad jejunandum istum tamquam constituerunt legitimam diem. Augustin. Ep. ad Casulan. 36, [al. 86], n. 27. Vid. ib. n. 29. Die quoque Dominico cum illis jejunant, *auditores scilicet*. Ep. 236, [al. 74], n. 2.

^z Dominica autem jejunare non possumus, quia Manichæos etiam ob istius dici jejunium damnamus. Ambr. Ep. 23. T. 2. p. 883, n. xi. ^a Vid. Leo. Sermon. iv. de Quadrag. et passim.

^b Manichæi resurrectionem abnegantes contra Christianos jejunium luctumque in die dominico faciunt, aientes, in isto die fore ut hoc sæculum subeat interitum dissolutionemque omnem post circulum novem millium annorum. ap. Asséman. Bib. Or. T. 4. p. 361. ^c B. T. 2. p. 709.

^d Cum sæpe a vobis quærerem illo tempore quo vos audiebam, quæ causa esset, quod Pascha Domini plerumque nulla, interdum a paucis tepidissima festivitate frequentaretur, — cum vestrum Bema, id est, diem quo Manichæus occisus est, quinque gradibus instructo tribunali, et pretiosis linteis adornato, — magnis honoribus prosequamini? Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 8. n. 9.

^e See T. 2. p. 711, n. xi.

^f Illo enim mense (Martio) Bema vestrum cum magna festivitate celebratis. Contr. Faust. l. 18, c. 5. Vid. not. ^d.

^g See before, p. 403, 404.

^h — vidimus ergo in quadrevio Carthaginis, — non unum, sed plures quam tres electos simul post transeuntes nescio quas feminas tam petulanti gestu adhinire. — Nos autem graviter commoti, graviter etiam quæsti sumus. Quis tandem hoc vindicandum, non dicam sepelitione ab ecclesia, sed pro magnitudine flagitii vehementi saltem objurgatione arbitratus

but, as it seems, little notice was taken of the matter. The excuse they made was, that their assemblies were then prohibited by the laws, and therefore some inconvenience might happen, if their principal men were disobliged. He argues with them, as if an elect would be degraded for eating the smallest bit of flesh.

SECT. VI. The Manichæan Doctrine concerning the Scriptures.

I. *A summary account of their scheme.* II. *They rejected the Old Testament.* III. *Their notion of John Baptist.* IV. *What books of the New Testament they received.* 1. *They received the New Testament in general, or the gospels, and the epistles of St. Paul.* 2. *What they said of St. Matthew's gospel.* 3. *Whether they received the Acts of the apostles?* 4. *They received St. Paul's epistles:* 5. *Particularly that to the Hebrews.* 6. *Of their receiving an epistle to the Laodiceans.* 7. *Whether they received the catholic epistles?* 8. *And the Revelation?* 9. *Probably, they received all the canonical scriptures of the New Testament.* V. *Proofs of their respect for the scriptures of the New Testament.* VI. *Of their pretence that the books of the New Testament had been corrupted and interpolated.* 1. *Passages of ancient catholic authors concerning that matter.* 2. *Passages of Faustus concerning the same.* VII. *Remarks upon the passages of Faustus.* VIII. *The Manichees vindicated from the charges of forging and interpolating scripture.* 1. *They did not forge a letter ascribed to Christ.* 2. *That they did not interpolate the books of the New Testament.* IX. *Of the apocryphal books used by them.* 1. *Augustine's definition of such books.* 2. *Proofs of their using apocryphal scriptures, and what.* 3. *An account of Leucius, a great writer of apocryphal books.* 1. *His works.* 2. *His opinions.* 3. *His time.* 4. *Remarks upon the works of Leucius, and the apocryphal books used by the Manichees.*

WE are now come to the principal point, and perhaps as difficult as any, to shew what books of scripture the Manichees received, and what regard they had for them.

I. Augustine's general account is to this effect: 'They^a say

bitratus est? Et hæc erat omnis excusatio impunitatis illorum, quod eo tempore quo conventicula eorum lege prohiberentur, ne quid læsi proderent, metuebatur. De Mor. Manich. c. 19, n. 68, 69.

^a Quæ ergo ratio est, vel potius amentia, de numero Electorum hominem pellere, qui forte carnem valetudinis causa, nulla cupiditate gustaverit? — Ita fit ut in Electis vestris esse non possit, qui proditus fuerit, non concupiscendo, sed medendo

partem aliquam cenasse gallinæ. De Mor. Manich. cap. 16, n. 51.

^a Deum, qui legem per Moysen dedit, et in Hebræis prophetis locutus est, non esse verum Deum, sed unum ex principibus tenebrarum. Ipsiisque Testamenti Novi scripturas tamquam infalsatas ita legunt, ut quod volunt ipsi accipiant, quod nolunt rejiciant, eisque tamquam totum verum habentes nonnullas apocryphas anteponunt. Aug. de Hær. c. 46.

' that

‘ that the God who delivered the law by Moses, and spake in the
 ‘ Hebrew prophets, is not the true God, but one of the princes
 ‘ of darkness. The scriptures of the New Testament they receive,
 ‘ but say they are interpolated, taking what they like, and reject-
 ‘ ing the rest, and preferring to them some apocryphal scriptures
 ‘ as containing the whole truth.’

Here are therefore four things to be observed by us,—their reject-
 ing the Old Testament; what books of the New Testament they
 received; then in what manner they received them, or what re-
 gard they had for them; and lastly, what apocryphal books
 they made use of.

II. Concerning the Old Testament.

That the Manichees universally, and all along, rejected the
 books of the Old Testament, or the Jewish scriptures, is evident
 from the testimonies of almost all writers, who have taken any
 notice of this people.

It is intimated by ^b Serapion.

The design of the ^c third book of Titus of Bosra was to vin-
 dicate the Old Testament against their objections.

In The Acts of Archelaus it is represented as one article of
 Mani’s doctrine that ^d the Jewish prophets were deceived by the
 princes of darkness: that ^e the princes of darkness spake with
 Moses, and the Jewish priests and prophets. Mani ^f himself is there
 made to speak to the same purpose, and to say that there are
 some things true and right inserted in the Jewish scriptures, that
 the wrong might be received, but that nothing before John the
 Baptist ought to be admitted as of authority.

Fauftus, we may be sure, does ^g not speak with greater re-
 verence of the God of the Jews, than other Manichees.

He says moreover, that ^h the moral precepts of the law of Mo-
 ses were not revealed by him; for they are as old as the world,
 and are of perpetual obligation. They ⁱ were taught Enoch,

^b — μὴτε τὸν νόμον τιμῶντες. Serap. ap.
 Canif. Ant. Lect. T. i. p. 47, f. Conf. p.
 54, sub fin.

^c ο τρίτος ὑπὲρ τῆς νομῆς
 καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ποιεῖται λόγον, ὡς παρὰ τῆς
 θεῆς πάσης τῆς πάλαιας διαθήκης δοθείσης.
 Tit. p. 59. ap. Canif.

^d Περὶ δὲ τῶν
 παρ’ ἡμῖν προφητῶν ὅτως λέγει· πνεῦμα ἐστὶν αἰσέ-
 σιας, ἥτοι ἀνομίας τῆς σκοτίας, κ. λ. Ap.
 Arch. c. 10, p. 18.

^e Τοὺς δὲ λαλήσαντα
 μετὰ Μωσέως, καὶ τῶν Ἰσραηλίων, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν,
 τὸν ἀρχόντα λέγει εἶναι τὴν σκοτίαν. Ib. cap.
 xi. p. 20.

^f Sed et ea quæ in prophe-
 tis et in lege scripta sunt ipsi [Satanæ,]
 adscribenda sunt. Ipse est enim qui in
 prophetis tunc locutus est—— et scri-
 bere pauca quedam vera, ut per hæc

etiam cætera quæ sunt falsa crederentur.
 Unde bonum nobis est ex omnibus quæ
 usque ad Joannem scripta sunt, nihil om-
 nino suscipere. Ap. Arch. c. 13, p. 25.
 Vid. et p. 26. ^g Placet ad ingluviem
 Judeorum dæmonis, (neque enim Dei,) nunc
 taurus, nunc arietes, cultris sternere?
 Fauft. l. 18, c. 2. ^h — diffamata in
 gentibus, id est, ex quo mundi hujus cre-
 atura exiit. Id. l. 22, c. 2.

ⁱ Hæc autem erant antiquitus in nati-
 onibus, ut est in promptu probare, olim
 promulgata per Enoch, et Seth, et cæte-
 ros eorum similes justos, quibus eadem il-
 lufires tradiderint angeli temperandæ in
 hominibus gratia feritatis. Id. l. 19, c. 3.

Seth,

Seth, and the other ancient patriarchs by angels, for the good government of the world. These laws Moses inserted in his two tables.

Epiphanius in his Synopsis briefly says, they ^k blaspheme the Old Testament, and the God that speaks therein. And in his long argument with them he often takes notice of ^l their disadvantageous notion of the Old Testament.

Hilary ^m speaks of their enmity to the law and the prophets.

Cyril of Jerusalem ⁿ takes notice of the same thing.

In Jerom, ^o Mani is frequently joined with Marcion, and others, who rejected the Old Testament.

Augustine had frequent occasion to speak of this matter, and sometimes says they ^p presumed to affirm that 'the law given by Moses was not from God, but from one of the princes of 'darkness.' And he informs us that ^q this was one of those arguments in which they triumphed; and that they had too much success in deceiving weak people by the objections they brought against the Old Testament. Archelaus too intimates that Mani argued upon this point with much confidence, and in a specious manner, when he says he ^r thought the devil helped him. Indeed it is thought by some that ^s the ancient Christians were not able to defend the Old Testament so well as we have done in late times.

It would be tedious to mention all the Manichæan objections; I shall however take notice of some of them.

They pretended to take offence at the representations ^t given of God in the Old Testament, as if he had bodily parts and human passions; as if he was ignorant of some things, and envious, and cruel, and passionate.

Their

^k Παλαιαν διαθεκην βλασφημῶντες, καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ λαλῶσαντα θεόν. Epiph. T. i. p. 605. ^l Id. Hær. 66, c. 43, p. 656. c. 70, p. 691, et passim.

^m Manichæus enim abrupti in improbanda lege et prophetis furoris. Hil. de Trin. l. 6, n. 10, p. 884. ⁿ Cat. 6, c. 27, p. 104. ^o Et contrario hæretici, Marcion et Manichæus, et omnes qui veterem legem rabido ore dilaniant. Hieron. in Ecc. T. 2, p. 778, in. Non quo legem juxta Manichæum et Marcionem destruamus. Id. ad Aug. Ep. 74, [al. 89.] p. 624.

^p m. Audi Marcion et Manichæus, et ceteri hæretici, qui vetus laniant instrumentum. Id. in Matt. c. x. T. 4, P. i. p. 33, m. Audi Marcion, audi Manichæ, bonæ margaritæ sunt lex et prophetæ, et notitia veteris testamenti. Id. in Matt. c. 13, p. 59, f. Aliud est damnare legem, quod Manichæus facit, aliud legi præferre

evangelium, quæ apostolica doctrina est. Id. in Dial. i. adv. Pelag. T. 4, p. 503, in.

^q Patriarchas prophetasque blasphemant. Legem per famulum Dei Moysen datam, non a vero Deo dicunt, sed a principe tenebrarum. Aug. Ep. 236. al. 74.

^r Nam bene nosti, quod reprehendentes Manichæi catholicam fidem, et maxime vetus testamentum discerpentes et dilanantes, commovent imperitos. Id. De Util. Cred. c. 2, n. 4, T. 8. ^s Deinde cœpit dicere plurima ex Lege, multa etiam de Evangelio, et Apostolo Paulo, quæ sibi videntur esse contraria: quæ etiam cum fiducia dicens, nihil pertimescit. Credo, quod habeat adiutorem draconem illum, qui nobis semper inimicus est. Arch. cap. 40, p. 69. ^t See Beauf. T. i. p. 283, &c.

^u —nunc ignarum futuri, —nunc ut improvidum —nunc ut invidum et timentem, ne si gustaret homo suus de

Their objections against the first three chapters of the book of *Genesis* may be seen in ^a Faustus, and in a work of ^x Augustine, purposely written in defence of the beginning of that book.

Faustus argues, that ^y they were not Jews, but Gentiles: that they came directly to Christ, and not by the way of Judaism. If therefore there had been, as possibly there were, Gentile prophets, they would be more profitable to them than the Jewish.

They said that, ^z whilst they were Gentiles and before they believed, the scriptures of the Old Testament were useless, because they could then be of no authority with them; and when the gospel was embraced, they were altogether needless.

They said they ^a were satisfied with the New Testament, which the Jews rejected, and that very much, out of too great a regard for the Old.

They found fault with ^b the Israelites spoiling the Egyptians by the order of Moses.

The appointment of sacrifices, such as those in the law of Moses, they pretended was unworthy of God, and therefore was not from him, but from some evil beings. This way of arguing is ascribed to Mani ^c in The Acts of Archelaus, and is also made use of by ^d Faustus.

It is easy to think they ^e did not fail to expose the ordinance of circumcision, as much as they were able.

They

de ligno vitæ in æternum viveret; nunc alias et appetentem sanguinis atque adipis ex omni genere sacrificiorum — nunc irascentem in alienos, nunc in suos, nunc perimentem millia hominum ob levia quidem aut nulla commissa; nunc etiam comminantem, venturum se fore cum gladio, et parciturum nemini, non justo non peccatori. Faust. l. 22, c. 4.

^a ibid.

^x Aug. de Genesi contra Manichæos. libr. iii. Tom. i.

^y Porro autem nos natura Gentiles sumus, — sub alia nati lege, — non ante effecti Judæi, ut merito Hebraicorum sequeremur fidem, euntes ad Christianismum. — Ita nihil, ut dixi ecclesiæ Christianæ Hebræorum testimonia conferunt, quæ magis constet ex Gentibus quam ex Judæis. Sane si sunt aliqua, ut fama est, Sibyllæ de Christo præfagia, aut Hermetis, quem dicunt Trismegistum, aut Orphei, aliorumque in Gentilitate vatum; hæc nos aliquanto ad fidem juvare potuerunt, qui ex Gentibus efficitur Christiani. &c. Faust. l. 13, c. i.

^z Hebræorum vero testimonia nobis, etiam si sint vera, ante fidem inutilia sunt, post fidem supervacua; quia ante fidem eis credere non poteramus,

nec vero ex superfluo eredinus. Faust. l. 13, c. i.

^a Quare non accipis Testamentum vetus? Quia et omne vas plenum superfusa non recipit, sed effundit, — Proinde et Judæi ex præoccupatione Moyses Testamento veteri satiati, respuerunt novum. Id. l. 15, cap. i. in.

^b Ibi vero Moses argentum et aurum ab Ægyptiis fumens, cum populus fugisset ex Ægypto. Jesus autem nihil proximi desiderandum præcepit. Ap. Arch. c. 40, p. 69.

^c Ipse [Satanas] est enim, qui in prophetis tunc locutus est, plurimas eis de Deo ignorantias suggerens, et tentationes, et concupiscentias. Sed et devorantorem eum sanguinis et carnis ostendunt. Quæ omnia ad eum pertinent Satanam, et ad prophetas ejus. Ap. Arch. c. 13, p. 25.

^d Placet ad ingluviem Judæorum demonis — nunc tauros, nunc arietes, nunc etiam hircos, ut non et homines dicam, cultris sternere: ac propter quod idola sumus exosi, id nunc exercere crudelius sub prophetis ac lege? Faust. l. 18, c. 2. Vid. supr. not. ^t.

^e Nam peritomen ego ut pudendam despui, ac, si non fallor, et tu. Id. l. 6, c. i. Placet circumcidi, id est, pudendis insignire

They pretended that ^f the law and the gospel were contrary to each other, and therefore they were not both from one and the same being. In the Old Testament men are encouraged by the hopes of riches, and other temporal blessings. But Jesus Christ bleffeth the poor, and declareth that no man can be his disciple who forsaketh not all that he hath. This argument is put into the mouth of ^g Mani in The Acts of Archelaus: and it is with the utmost disdain that ^h Faustus speaks of the blessings promised in the Old Testament; such as riches, plenty, long life, a numerous progeny, a land flowing with milk and honey. He is fully satisfied with the spiritual blessings of the gospel. Nor would he accept of such good things as the law promiseth, if offered him. Again, says Faustus: 'Our ⁱ church is poor indeed, but she is married to Christ, who is rich: and she is contented with the estate of her husband: nor will she hold any strange correspondence, or receive either presents or letters from another.'

The Manichees ^k took great liberties in reviling the patriarchs and the kings of Israel for the practice of polygamy: and they unmercifully aggravated the faults, which some good men of the Old Testament were surpris'd into, and misrepresented some other things. Faustus is very copious in his declamations upon these points.

signire pudenda, et Deum credere sacramentis talibus delectari? Id. l. 18, c. 2.

^f Legem Moyfi, ut breviter dicam, dicebat hic non esse Dei boni, sed maligni principis, nec habere eam quicquam cognitionis ad novam legem Christi; sed esse contrariam et inimicam, alteram alteri obstitentem. Arch. c. 40, p. 69.

^g Dicebat ergo, quod ibi dixerit Deus, Ego divitem et pauperem facio. Hic vero Jesus beatos diceret pauperes. Addebat etiam, quod nemo possit ejus esse discipulus, nisi renunciaret omnibus quæ haberet. Id. ib.

^h Cur non accipis Testamentum vetus? Quia et ab ipso hoc, et ex novo didicimus, aliena non concupiscere.

—Divitias promittit, et ventris satietatem, et filios et nepotes, vitamque longam, et Chananitidis regnum. —Judæis bona sua habere, libens volensque permisi, solo scilicet evangelio, et regni cælorum splendida hæreditate contentus. Faust. l. x. c. 1. Secunda vero causa est, quod tam etiam misera ejus, et corporalis, ac longe ab animæ commodis hæreditas est, ut post beatam illam novi Testamenti pollicitationem, quæ cælorum mihi regnum, et vitam perpetuam repromittit, etiam si gratis eam mihi testator suus ingereret, fasti-

tidirem. Id. l. 4, c. i.

ⁱ Et quia ecclesia nostra, sponsa Christi, pauperior quidem ei nupta, sed diviti, contenta sit bonis mariti sui, humilium amatorum dedignatur opes. Sordent ei Testamenti veteris et ejus auctoris munera, famæque suæ custos diligentissima, nisi sponsi sui non accipit literas. Faust. l. 15, c. i.

^k —soceros dormire cum nuriis, tamquam Judas; patres cum filiabus, tamquam Loth; prophetas cum fornicatricibus, tamquam Osee; maritos uxorum suarum noctes amatoribus vendere, tamquam Abraham; duabus germanis sororibus unum misceri maritum, tamquam Jacob; rectores populi, et quos maxime entheos credas, millenis et centenis volutari cum scortis, tamquam David et Salomon. Faust. l. 32, c. 4. Vid. et l. 22, c. 3, 5. l. 12, c. 1.

^l —ac per hoc et Judæorum patres, Abraham scilicet et Isaac et Jacob —quamquam fuerunt ipsi flagitiosissimi; ut fere Moses indicat eorum pronepos, sive quis alius historię ejus conditor est, quæ dicitur Geneleos, qui eorum vitas nobis odio omni fastidioque dignissimas scripsit. Faust. l. 33, c. 1.

And Augustine tells us that ^m when he was young they would come to him, and ask, ‘if he thought they were righteous men who had more than one wife at a time?’

Jerom informs us that ⁿ they alleged those words of our Lord in John x. 8: *All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers.* And in fact the Manichæan bishop and author, so often quoted already, fails not to insist upon ^o this text, and to apply it particularly to Moses.

Jerom represents the Manichees arguing that ^p it was allowed the law of Moses was abolished, and therefore we ought to receive the New Testament only.

The catholic Christians maintained the authority of the Old Testament, and put the Manichees in mind of divers things contained in the New; as those words of our Lord himself, Matth. v. 17: *I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil.*

This is in The ^q Acts of Archelaus, where Mani by way of answer says: ‘Christ never spake those words, for it is not true that he fulfilled the law, but that he destroyed it.’

Fauftus in his work likewise proposes this catholic objection, to which he gives a variety of answers, weak and trifling.

They are such as these: ‘This ^r is related by Matthew only, and as spoken by Christ in his sermon on the mount: when he was not present, but only the first four disciples, who attended on him before Matthew was called. Of those disciples who were present at that sermon none have written a gospel but John, who says nothing of this matter. It may therefore be

^m — cum a me quærent, — et utrum iusti existimandi essent, qui haberent uxores multas simul. Confess. l. 3, c. 7, n. 12. ⁿ — detrahens prophetis eius, quasi auctoritate testimonii evangelici, in quo salvator ait: Omnes qui venerunt ante me fures fuerunt et latrones. Hier. in Is. T. 3, p. 171. ^o Quippe cum et ipsum dicentem audirem, fures fuisse et latrones omnes qui venerunt ante se. Qua sententia primum omnium video feriri Moysen. Faust. l. 16, c. 2.

^p Manichæus nobis confurgit repente, qui legem dicit abolitam, et solos novi Testamenti legendos libros. Adv. Pelag. l. 2, T. 4, p. 510, m. ^q Ego audiens, dicebam eis sermonem evangelicum, quomodo dixit Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Non veni solvere legem, sed adimplere. Ille vero ait, nequaquam eum hunc dixisse sermonem: Cum enim ipsam inveniamus eum resolvisse legem, necesse est nos hoc potius intelligere quod fecit.

Arch. c. 40, p. 69. ^r Cur Legem non accipitis et Prophetas, cum Christus eos non se venisse solvere dixerit, sed adimplere? quis hoc testatur dixisse Jesum? Matthæus. Ubi dixisse? In monte. Quibus præsentibus? Petro, Andrea, Jacobo et Joanne, quatuor his tantum: cæteros enim necdum elegerat, nec ipsum Matthæum. Ex his ergo quatuor unus, id est, Joannes, Evangelium scripsit? Ita. Aliubi hoc ipse commemorat? Nusquam. Quomodo ergo quod Joannes non testatur, qui fuit in monte, Matthæus hoc scripsit, qui longo intervallo, postquam Jesus de monte descendit, secutus est eum? Ac per hoc de hoc ipso primo ambigitur, utrum Jesus tale aliquid dixerit, quia testis idoneus tacet, loquitur autem minus idoneus: ut interim permiserimus nobis injuriam fecisse Matthæum, donec et ipsum probemus hæc non scripisse. — Faust. l. 17, c. i.

'questioned whether Jesus ever spoke these words.' He also says that Matthew himself did not write this, which will be considered another time.

Then he adds, that * all in general are agreed that Christ came not to fulfil the law, but to destroy it.

After which † he comes again to the Manichæan principle, of examining and judging what is right, what not, in the scriptures, and rejecting what does not appear agreeable to truth. And he pretends that ‡ if the catholics will maintain the genuineness of this text, they ought to obey all the laws of Moses, and be no longer Christians, but Jews.

Finally, he says, let * us consider what law is here spoken of, for there are several laws. There is the law of Moses, the law of nature, and of truth. Which last he says is spoken of by the apostle, Rom. viii. 2, calling it *the law of the spirit of life*. And † there are other prophets, beside those of the Jews: and that ‡ our Saviour does not here speak of their law, appears from the things he discourseth of; which are not the peculiar ordinances of the Mosaic law, but those precepts which are of eternal obligation.

The catholics put them in mind likewise of John v. 46: *Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me.*

To which Faustus makes divers answers: as † that, upon searching the writings of Moses, he could not find any prophecies concerning Christ. Therefore our Lord never spoke in this manner, for all his words are true. And he himself elsewhere declares, *All who were before him were thieves and robbers*, particularly striking at Moses. Moreover, upon divers occasions, when he might have referred the Jews to Moses and the prophets, he

* Uterque enim nostrum sub hac notatione Christianus est, quia Christum in destructionem legis et prophetarum venisse putavimus. l. 18, c. 1.

† Et tamen me quidem jam adversus capituli hujus necessitudinem Manichæa fides reddidit tutum, — Ib. c. 3, in.

‡ Nempe cogeris aut vanæ superstitioni succumbere, aut capitulum profiteri falsum, aut te Christi negare discipulum. l. 18, c. 3, f.

* Ecce jam consentio dictum. — Sunt autem legum genera tria: unum quidem Hebræorum, quod peccati et mortis Paulus appellat: aliud vero Gentium, quod naturale vocat. Tertium vero genus legis est veritas, quod perinde significans apostolus dicit, Lex enim spiritus vitæ in Christo Jesu liberavit me a lege peccati et mortis. Id. l. 19, c. 1, 2.

† Item Pro-

phetæ, alii sunt Judæorum, alii Gentium, alii veritatis. Ib. c. 2.

‡ Lege ergo tripartita, et tripartitis Prophetis, de quonam eorum Jesus dixerit, non satis liquet. Est tamen conjicere ex consequentibus. &c. ib. c. 3.

* Quare Moysem non accipitis, cum Christus dicat: Moyse de me scripsit, et si crederetis Moyse, crederetis mihi? — Nam ego quidem scripturas eius perscrutatus, — nullas ibidem de Christo prophetias inveni. — Unde in ingenti positus æstu, ratione coagebar in alterum e duobus; ut aut falsum pronuntiarem capitulum hoc, aut mendacem Jesum. Sed id quidem alienum pietatis erat, Deum existimare mentitum. Rectius ergo visum est, scriptoribus adscribere salutem, quam veritatis auctori mendacium, &c. Id. l. 16, c. i. ii.

only directs them to consider his miracles, and the testimony given to him from heaven by God the Father.

For all which reasons he pretends he may conclude that this paragraph is not genuine, but has been inserted by the corrupters of scripture, who have here said what is not true.

This may suffice for shewing the opinion and the arguments of the Manichees concerning the Old Testament.

III. I shall only add a word or two for shewing what they thought of John the Baptist.

Didymus of Alexandria intimates that ^b they did not admit his authority, reckoning him one of the Old Testament. And Photius says of Agapius, the Manichee, that ^c he reviled not only Moses and the prophets, but the forerunner likewise. But, in The Acts of Archelaus, Mani is said ^d to have spoken of John the Baptist as a preacher of the kingdom of heaven. Beausobre therefore concludes that ^e the Manichees received John's testimony to the divine mission of our Saviour. And indeed Didymus himself intimates, in the place before referred to, that ^f they were willing to argue from some things said by John the Baptist. Perhaps they were not all of the same opinion about him. Nor is it any great wonder that men should differ upon the question, whether John the Baptist belonged to the Old Testament or to the New.

IV. In the next place we are to consider what books of the New Testament were received by the Manichees. I shall observe the testimonies of divers authors.

1. Serapion, having said he would not insist upon matters in the Old Testament, adds: 'Since ^g they respect the gospels, my proofs shall be taken from them.' What books of the New Testament he quoted in his work against the Manichees was shewn ^h formerly.

Titus of Bostra expressly says, 'they ⁱ receive the gospel.' Several of his passages will be more particularly cited hereafter, when we come to observe what they said of the interpolation of the scriptures. But when Titus here says, 'they received the

^b ἡ γὰρ δέχονται τὸν βαπτιστὴν ἰωάννην, τυγχάνοντα ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς γραφῆς. Didym. contr. Manich. p. 214. ^c Τὴν δὲ παλαιὰν γραφὴν καμύδει, μωσθεὶς καὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς προφητείας, καὶ τοῦ προδρόμου. Phot. cod. 179, p. 404.

^d Aiebat autem, Joannem regnum cœlorum prædicare; nam et per abscissionem capitis ejus hoc esse indicatum, quod omnibus prioribus et superioribus ejus abscissis, posteriora sola servanda sint. Arch. cap.

40, p. 70. Vid. ib. c. 13, p. 25, 26.

^e Beauf. T. i. p. 289.

^f Εἰ δὲ καὶ κενὸν προφερόντο, τὸ ληθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἰωάννου—ἀκητεῖσθαι, ὅτι ἡ δύναται προφέρειν ἀφ' ἧν μὴ παραδίδονται. Did. ib. p. 213, 214.

^g Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ εὐαγγέλια μεμελετῆται αὐτοῖς, ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελίων προσηλθὼν ὁ εὐαγγέλιος. Serap. ap. Canif. T. i. p. 54, infr. m. ^h See p. 386.

ⁱ Το εὐαγγέλιον παραδίδωμεν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἡ παραδίδονται. Tit. l. 3, p. 140, f.

'gospel,'

'gospel,' he means, I think, the New Testament in general, because the gospel is there opposed to the law and the prophets.

Epiphanius says they ^k pretended that the two testaments were contrary to each other. He likewise says that 'when ^l they reject the Old Testament, many things may be alleged from the 'gospels and from the apostles to confute them.' They acknowledged the New Testament therefore, both the gospels and the epistles of the apostles, as of authority.

St. Jerom's account, in the place above referred to, is, they ^m say the law is abolished, and that the books of the New Testament only are to be attended to by us.

Fauftus often says that ⁿ he receives the gospel; meaning thereby the doctrine taught by Jesus Christ.

He says that ^o he, as well as the catholics, own Jesus to be the author of the New Testament or covenant.

He mentions ^p the four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, without hinting that there were any other authentic historians of Jesus Christ.

He seems to allow that John wrote the gospel under his name. For, ^q mentioning Peter and Andrew, James and John, as the first and most early disciples of Jesus, he says: 'of all these four 'John only wrote a gospel.'

In The Acts of Archelaus it is expressly said that 'Mani' 'argued from the gospel, and the apostle Paul;' that is, from the gospels, and from the epistles of that apostle.

Photius, in his extracts from Agapius, says that 'he' ^r quoted 'many passages of the divine gospel, and the epistles of the divine Paul.'

^k Φασκει γαρ τας δυο διαθηκας εναντιας προς αλληλας. Hæg. 66, c. 42, in.

^l Και ποσα εστιν επιει δια των ευαγγελιων, και των αποστολων εις ελεγχον της τη μανημανιας — τη σωτηρος ομολογουντος την παλαιαν διαθηκην, η μονον, αλλα και αυτοι αποστολοι. κ. λ. Id. H. 66, c. 43, m.

^m — Manichæus nobis confurgit repente, qui legem dicit abolitam, et solos Novi Testamenti legendos libros. Adv. Pelag. l. 2. T. 4, p. 510.

ⁿ Accipis Evangelium? Et maxime. Faust. l. 2, c. 1. Accipis Evangelium? Tu me interrogas, utrum accipiam, in quo id ipsum apparet, quia quæ jubet observo. — Nisi adhuc nescis, quid sit quod Evangelium nuncupatur. Est enim nihil aliud, quam prædicatio et mandatum Christi. Id. l. 5, c. 1.

^o — quod Novum Testamentum Jesum condidisse utrique fatemur. Id. l.

18, c. 1.

^p Sed offensus duorum Evangelistarum maxime disensione, qui genealogiam ejus scribunt, Lucæ et Matthæi, hæsi incertus quemnam potissimum sequeretur. — Infinita ergo eorum prætermissa lite, — ad Joannem Marcumque me contuli: nec impariter a duobus ad duos, et ab Evangelistis ad ejusdem nominis professores. Faust. l. 3, c. i.

^q Quibus præsentibus? Petro, Andrea, Jacobo et Joanne. — Ex his quatuor unus, id est, Joannes Evangelium scripsit? Ita. Faust. l. 17, c. i.

^r Deinde cœpit dicere plurima ex Lege, multa etiam de Evangelio, et Apostolo Paulo, quæ sibi videntur esse contraria. Arch. c. 40, p. 69.

^s — αποσπαρασσω δι ρητα τινα τη διει ευαγγελιου, και επιστολων τη διει παυλου, περιεται γριφλιν αυτα, και προς την οικειαν δυσσεβειαν ελκειν. Ph. Cod. 179, p. 405.

Augustine speaks of ^t their using the four gospels, and the epistles of Paul; and frequently of their ^u approving or ^x admitting the authority of the gospel and the apostle.

2. With regard to St. Matthew's gospel, Faustus has disputed it's genuineness. He is answering the catholic argument for the authority of the Old Testament, taken from the words of our Lord in Matt. v. 17: and, among other things, he says that Matthew did not write this: and that he is not the author of the gospel under his name may be concluded from what is said Matt. ix. 9. *And as Jesus passed forth from thence he saw a man named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom; and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed him.* Faustus argues, that if Matthew were the writer he would have said: 'Jesus saw me, and called me, and I arose and followed him.' But certainly this argument is unworthy of a man of learning and consideration. The weakness of it is evident from many texts of the gospels not disputed by the Manichees. In John iii. 16, our Lord himself says: *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish.* John the evangelist speaks of himself in the third person several times: see John xix. 26. xx. 2. xxi. 7, 20. It is a common thing for Josephus, the Jewish historian, to ^z speak of himself after the like manner. And does not every one perceive that Matthew out of modesty might decline to speak of himself in the first person upon that occasion? Augustine has fully answered ^a this objection: and I have transcribed a part of what he says in the margin, for the satisfaction of inquisitive readers.

Not to add, what is also well observed by Augustine elsewhere, that ^b it is a vain imagination to think by such trifling objections

to

^t — Aut si talis oratio impudens est, sicuti est, cur in Pauli Epistolis, cur in quatuor Evangelii libris ea valere aliquid putant —? De Util. Cred. cap. 3, n. 7.

^u Nam quare ab eis, utrum bonum sit delectari lectione Apostoli, — et utrum bonum sit Evangelium disserere? Respondent ad singula: Bonum est. Conf. l. 8, c. x, p. 24.

^x Videamus, quemadmodum ipse Dominus in Evangelio nobis praecepit esse vivendum: quomodo etiam Paulus Apostolus. Has enim scripturas illi condemnare non audent. De M. E. C. c. 7, n. 13, in.

^y — ut interim permiserimus nobis injuriam fecisse Matthaeum, donec et ipsum probemus haec non scripsisse, sed alium nescio quem sub nomine eius: quod docet et ipsa lectionis ejusdem Matthaei obliqua narratio. Quid

enim dicit? Et cum transiret Jesus, vidit hominem sedentem ad telonium, nomine Matthaeum, et vocavit eum. At ille confestim surgens, secutus est eum. Et quis ergo de se ipso scribens, dicat, Vidit hominem, et vocavit eum, et secutus est eum: ac non potius dicat, Vidit me, et vocavit me, et secutus sum: nisi quin constat haec Matthaeum non scripsisse, sed alium nescio quem sub ejus nomine? &c. Id. l. 17, c. 1.

^z Vid. Joseph. de B. J. l. 2, c. 20, n. 4, 5, et passim.

^a Sed non usque adeo imperitum putaverim, ut nec legerit, nec audierit, soiere scriptores rerum gestarum, cum in suam personam venerint, ita se contexere tamquam de alio narrant, quod de se narrant. Contr. Faust. l. 17, c. 4.

^b — qui etiam de Evangelico [al. Evangelio,] tantae auctoritatis culmine omnibus

to overthrow the authority of a gospel so fully established as that of St. Matthew.

3. Augustine often intimates that the Manichees rejected the Acts of the apostles. He sometimes speaks as if their aversion to that book was very great, and they could scarce endure the mention of it. I have already cited several of his passages relating to this matter. To them * the reader is referred, and I entreat him to cast an eye upon them, though I add here ^c one or two more.

In one place he may be understood to say that ^d some of the Manichees reject this book. Perhaps others may interpret the place differently. But I have accidentally observed that ^e the composer of the general index in the Benedictine edition of Augustine's works did not understand him to say 'certain people called Manichees,' but 'some of the Manichees.'

And indeed I question whether the Manichees did all, and always, reject the book of the Acts as they did the scriptures of the Old Testament.

For first, I do not see any reason they had to reject the Acts any more than the gospels, or other books of the New Testament. Augustine himself says that ^f in other books of the New Testament there are like things to those in the Acts: and that as they pretended other books of the New Testament were interpolated, they might have said the same of this likewise. That indeed, as he observes, would have been a groundless and impudent assertion: but if that had been what they chose to say of

omnibus noto, mentiri sic audet, ut non Mattheum, ne apostolici nominis pondere comprimatur, sed nescio quem alium sub Matthæi nomine velit putari scripsisse de Christo, quod non vult credere, et quod calumniosa verusitas refutare conatur. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 23, c. 6.

* See before, p. 449, 450.

^c Qua potestate Petrus apostolus usus est in eo libro quem isti non accipiunt, quoniam manifeste continet Paracleti adventum, id est, consolatoris Sancti Spiritus.

Contr. Adim. c. 17, n. 5. Quod non solum in Actibus Apostolorum canonicis, quos isti non accipiunt, ne de adventu veri Paracleti, quem promissit Dominus, convincantur, evidenter apparet. Contr. Faust. l. 19, c. 31. Deinde Paracletum sicut promissum legimus in iis libris, quorum non omnia vultis accipere; ita et missum legimus in eo libro, quem nominare etiam formidatis. In Actibus quippe Apostolorum — apertissime legitur minus die Pentecostes Spiritus Sanctus.

ib. l. 32, c. 15.

^d Nam quidem Manichæi canonicum librum, cuius titulus est Actus Apostolorum, repudiant. Aug. ad Ceret. Ep. 237, [al. 253], n. 7. Vid. supra 449, note 9.

^e See the general Index in the word Manichæi — ex eis quidam Actus Apostolorum repudiant. 2. Tom. Ep. 237.

^f Hoc enim de illo libro fecerunt, qui Actus Apostolorum inscribitur. Quod eorum consilium, cum mecum ipse pertracto, nequeo satis mirari. — Tanta enim liber iste habet, quæ similia sunt his quæ accipiunt, ut magnæ stultitiæ mihi videatur, non et hunc accipere, et, si quid ibi eos offendit, falsum atque immisum dicere. Aut si talis oratio impudens est, sicuti est, cur in Pauli Epistolæ, cur in quatuor Evangelii libris ea valere aliquid putant, in quibus haud scio an multo plura sint proportionem, quam in illo libro esse potuerunt, quæ a corruptoribus interjecta credi volunt? De Ut. Cred. c. 3, n. 7.

this book, it would have been no more unreasonable than their saying it of the rest; for there were not here more things contrary to their opinions, than in the other books which they did receive,

Secondly, I have observed that several Greek writers of the fourth century, or thereabouts, in their disputes with the Manichees, cite this book as if it was received by them.

The Acts are quoted in The Dispute of ^s Archelaus.

Serapion having alleged the history in 2 Kings xiii. 21, adds: 'But^h if they pay no regard to these things, and despise the law, let them however hearken to what is said of sick people being healed by the very shadow of Peter's body, and let that fill them with confusion:' where he plainly refers to Acts v. 15.

Titus of Bostra argues with them out of the Acts. The Manichees pretended that the dispensation of the law was cruel and unmerciful. They excepted against Elisha's cursing the children, which presently afterwards were devoured by two bears: and against Elijah's calling for fire from heaven to consume the captains with their men, sent to him from the king of Israel. Whereupon Titus answers: 'Ifⁱ they condemn these actions as evil, what will they say of Paul, when observing that Barjesus, who was with the proconsul Sergius Paulus, strove to turn him from the truth, he deprived him of eyesight, and said: *O full of all subtilty?*' and what follows: Acts xiii. 10. He likewise adds: 'And^k what will they say of Peter, who, when Ananias and Sapphira brought a part only of the price of what they had sold, and he had convicted them of lying, struck Ananias dead, and afterwards delivered Sapphira to the same grave?' Upon these instances Titus proceeds to argue a great deal, without any suspicion of their contesting the credit and authority of the book whence they are taken.

Epiphanius^l, in his argument with the Manichees, quotes the Acts of the apostles several times.

Didymus of Alexandria likewise, in his short tract against them, expressly quotes^m the same book for a part of the history of St. Stephen.

^s Vid. Arch. c. 34. p. 59, c. 36, p. 63.

^h ——— Εἰ δὲ μανichaῖοι πρὸς αὐτὸν μικροί, καὶ τὸ λεγόμεν διαβάλλουσι. μὴτε τὸν νόμον τιμῶντες, καὶ ἐκ τῆ παραλλήλου δυνάμεισθαι, καὶ ἡ σκία ποτε τὴν γύμνησιν αἰσχυρίζεται κ. λ. Serap. p. 47, f.

ⁱ Καὶ ἐν τούτοις αἰτίας καὶ τοιαύταις ἐπιθυμίας ἐν ταύτῃ πορείᾳ καὶ κακίας τίθεται, τί ἐστὶ περὶ παιδῶν; οὐκ ὅτε τὸν λεγόμενον εὐαγγέλιον τὸν μαρτυρῶν, ——— ἐπιτι-

μῃσι, γερῶσιν τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐργασάτο. Tit. contr. Manich. l. 3, p. 155.

^k Τὶ δὲ ἐρεῖσι περὶ τῆ ποτε ——— τὸν μὲν ἀνάνιαν νεκρὸν ἐδείξε, τὴν δὲ σαπφείραν τῶν αὐτῶν μνημάτων παρεδόωκεν; Id. ib.

^l Vid. H. 66, c. 61, p. 674. B. c. 62, p. 675. B. et C.

^m ——— ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν τῶν ἀποστόλων γέγραπται, κ. λ. Didym. contr. Manich. p. 208.

All this seems sufficient to render it probable that the Manichees did not always, and every where, reject the Acts of the apostles: if they had so done, Archelaus, or Serapion, or Titus, or Epiphanius, or Didymus, must have known it, and would have taken some notice of it.

We have therefore Augustine's single testimony alone against them upon this head; which can affect only the Manichees of his time in Africa, if it be valid so far.

I do not recollect that Faustus has any thing which can afford us much light. He has quoted ^a the tenth of the Acts: but it is not in such a manner as to decide the question. He may be supposed likewise to refer to ^o the fifteenth chapter.

Upon the whole, I somewhat doubt whether the Manichees were so much offended at this book as Augustine insinuates.

If the reader thinks it may be of any use for finding out the Manichæan sentiment concerning the book of the Acts, he may observe the testimony of the Paulicians to the New Testament, which will be taken notice of hereafter. They are commonly reckoned a branch of this sect; and it is said that some of them did not receive the Acts.

Beausobre, considering this matter, says: 'Nevertheless, ^p Augustine has well observed that ^a the Manichees might have received the book of the Acts, and yet avoid the difficulties they would then have been urged with, by only making the like exceptions, which they did to evade the testimony of the gospels. Which,' as that learned author adds, 'has made me think that the true reason why the Manichees excluded the history of the apostles from their canon, was, that it had not in the eastern churches, from the beginning, the same authority with the gospels and epistles.' After which he refers to a well known passage of St. Chrysostom.

But I am rather of opinion that this book was not always rejected by the Manichees: and I rely upon the reasons just assigned, without adding any thing farther.

Nor can I allow that the Acts of the apostles was not of authority from the beginning in the eastern churches: for it was received by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, and other Christians in the east, as has been already shewn in this work.

^a ——— quemadmodum et illud, quod de Petro soletis adferre, tamquam idem viderit aliquando de cœlo demissum vas, in quo essent omnia genera animalium et serpentes. Faust. l. 31, c. 3.

* De mandato vero abstinendi a cibis

communibus, visum vobis est et vehementer creditum, morticina quidem et immolata esse sane immunda. l. 32, c. 3.

^p B. T. i. p. 293.

Cred. cap. 3.

^s De Util.

4. I next observe what epistles of apostles they admitted.

Augustine speaks of it as an undoubted and well known thing, that the^r Manichees read, admired and commended St. Paul's epistles.

In another place he speaks^s of their having, reading, and commending, or commenting upon, the epistles of the apostles.

He also speaks^t of their receiving the gospel, and the canonical epistles: meaning by this last expression, as I apprehend, the epistles commonly received by other Christians as a part of their canon; not those sometimes called catholic, as^u Beausobre thought. The first sense is agreeable to Augustine's use of the word in other^x places.

I suppose there is no doubt but they received thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul.

Photius, speaking of Agapius, in the^y passage above cited, says, he quotes passages of the divine gospel, and of the epistles of the divine Paul.

Fauftus^z readily says, 'he receives the apostle;' thereby meaning Paul, or the epistles of that apostle. And in his yet remaining work he quotes expressly, and by name, many of them: as well as frequently without naming them: as^a the epistle to the Romans, the^b first and^c second to the Corinthians, to^d the Galatians, to^e the Ephesians, to^f the Colossians, to^g Titus.

5. Let us now consider whether the Manichees received the epistle to the Hebrews. There is some reason to think they did: for there are references to it in^h The Acts of Archelaus. Serapion, in his bookⁱ Against the Manichees, quotes this epistle, as does^k Titus of Bosra, and^l Didymus of Alexandria. Epiphanius, in his argument with these people, quotes this epistle^m several

^r Certe et ipsi Manichæi legunt apostolum Paulum, et laudant et honorant, et ejus epistolas male interpretando multos decipiunt. De Gen. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 2, n. 3.

^s Et tamen epistolas apostolorum, quibus hæc omnia constantur, tenetis, legitis, prædicatis. Contr. Faust. l. 12, c. 24.

^t — ut quidquid est in evangelio vel epistolis canonicis, quo adjuvari hæresim suam putent, id esse a Christo et Apostolis dictum teneant atque suadeant. Contr. Faust. l. 22, c. 15.

^u T. i. p. 292. ^x Qui etiam in scripturis canonicis Testamenti Novi, hoc est in veris evangelicis et apostolicis literis, non accipiunt omnia, — ad Ceret. Ep. 237, [ad. 253,] et passim.

^y See p. 501, note^s. ^z Apostolum accipis? Et maxime, Faust. l. xi. c. i.

^a Aut si vobis secundum quod ad Romanos scribit, credere cordi est. l. xi. c. i.

^b Quapropter idem rursum Apostolus ad Corinthios dicit. — l. 24, c. 1, fin.

^c Scribenque ad Corinthios. l. xi. c. 1. et passim.

^d Quippe Paulus inde Galatas arguit. l. 8, c. 1. Et ad Galatas de semetipso. l. 24, c. 1.

^e Dicit ad Ephesios. Id. l. 24, c. 1.

^f Necnon et ad ipsos Colossenses idipsum denuo dicit.

^g De Gentium [lege] vero si quis ambigit, audiat Paulum, qui scribens ad Titum de Cretensibus, dicit. Id. l. 19, c. 2.

^h Arch. c. 5, p. 7. c. 43, p. 77.

ⁱ Serap. p. 46, m. and see before, p. 386.

^k Tit. l. 3, p. 142, 153. See before, p. 389.

^l Did. p. 209.

^m Epiph. H. 66, c. 63, in. fin. c. 74, p. 695. B. c. 79, p. 701, D.

times. Augustine, in his book against Adimantus, quotes it^a together with the epistle to the Romans. He also quotes it^o in his answer to Faustus.

6. Timothy of Constantinople says the^p Manichees received an epistle to the Laodiceans: but possibly he means the Paulicians. However, I think this^q testimony can be of but little value here.

7. As for the Catholic Epistles, we cannot say any thing very particularly about them.

However Epiphanius, in his confutation of them, has quoted, beside most other books of the New Testament, the^r first and^s second epistles of Peter. Augustine, in his books against Faustus, again and again^t quotes the first epistle of Peter, as received by them. In another work against the Manichees he openly quotes^u the second epistle of Peter. And in his answer to Faustus he cites^v the first epistle of John, which is also quoted by Mani himself^y in The Acts of Archelaus.

8. Augustine, in his work against Faustus, quotes^z words of the Revelation with others of the first epistle to the Corinthians, as if they received the former as well as the latter: which may lead us to think that the Manichees, those in Africa at least, did not reject the book of the Revelation.

9. In a word, Augustine, Epiphanius, and other ancient catholic authors, who wrote against the Manichees, do so quote all the books of the New Testament, that one is induced to think they received all the evangelical scriptures which other Christians did; for if they had not those authors would have taken notice of it. They inform us distinctly, that the Manichees did not receive the Old Testament. If they had rejected any books of the New Testament, generally received, they would have mentioned it. Augustine indeed says, they did not receive the book of the Acts: but as he does not speak of their entirely dis-

^a Interpretatus Apostolus sabbatum ad Hebræos, cum dicit, *remanet igitur sabbatificus populo Dei*.—Apostolicam itaque interpretationem spiritaliter teneo. Contr. Adim. cap. 16, n. 3.

^o Contr. Faust. l. 6, c. 9.

^p *ἡ πεντηκονταδικατὴ πρὸς λαοδικαίους ἐπιστολή*. Tim. ap. Meurf. Var. Div. p. 117.

^q Le témoignage du Prêtre Timothée, ou de ceux, qu'ont interpolé son ouvrage, n'est d'aucun poids. Beauf. T. i. p. 366. Le Decret de Gelase, et le Formule de Timothée, ont été fort interpolés. Id. p. 396, 367, not. 2.

^r Har. 66, c. 73, p. 693. D.

^s Ib. c. 64, p. 678, B. et C.

^t Contr. F. l. 22, c. 14, et 20.

^u Quia vero et ipsi mali angeli non a Deo mali sunt conditi, sed peccando facti sunt mali, sic Petrus in epistola sua dicit: Si enim Deus angelis peccantibus non pepercit, — [2 Pet. ii. 4.] De Nat. Boni. cap. 33.

^v Quod etiam Joannes dicit: Filii Dei sumus, et non apparuit, quid erimus. [1 John iii. 2.] Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 18. ^y Ap. Arch. c. 14, p. 26. Vid. loc. citat. supra, p. 15.

^z Non solum enim in veteri Testamento scriptum est, *Quem enim diligit Deus, corrumpit* — sed etiam in novo, *Ego quem amo, arguo et castigo*. Apoc. iii. 19. Contr. F. l. 22, c. 14.

liking any of the rest, it may be hence inferred, that in other respects their canon of the New Testament was much the same with that of the catholics.

Augustine once ^a speaks of their not only rejecting some passages of the New Testament, but also of their chusing what books they pleased; but the only instance he produceth is that of the Acts: which confirms what has been just now said, that the Manichees did not reject any book of the New Testament, received by other Christians, except the book of the Acts, if indeed they rejected that. Augustine, who so often speaks of their not liking the Acts of the apostles, must some time have joined with it other books, if there had been any other disowned by them.

V. We have therefore now seen what books of the New Testament were generally received by the Manichees. Under the next particular we shall observe what they said of the scriptures of the New Testament being interpolated; where, it is likely, we shall more distinctly perceive what regard they had for them. Nevertheless I would add here some things for shewing the credit and authority which these scriptures had with them.

And it seems evident that they ascribed a good degree of authority to the books of the New Testament before mentioned. This appears from passages of Serapion, and others above cited, and from the constant method of arguing with them by Serapion, Titus, Epiphanius, and all authors in general who wrote against them. To add here only one instance from Serapion, who supposeth that he fully confutes and overthrows a sentiment of theirs by arguing from the New Testament in this manner: 'The ^b gospel says, publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of heaven before you. And Paul says, that Raab the harlot perished not with them that believed not.'

Augustine, at the beginning of one of his books against these men, says: 'I ^c will observe this method, to quote no texts but such as they cannot except against; that is, out of the New Testament only; and out of that too none of those texts which

^a Qui non accipiunt omnia, sed quod volunt, et libros eligunt quos accipiant, aliis improbat. Sed in singulis quibusque libris loca distinguunt, quæ putant suis erroribus convenire. Cætera in eis pro falsis habent. Nam quidam Manichæi canonicum librum, cuius titulus est Actus Apostolorum, repudiant. Aug. Ep. 237, [al. 253,] T. 2.

^b Όταν η λέξη το ευαγγέλιον—ὅταν λέγῃ παῦλος.—Serap. p. 46, infr. m.

^c Et ea de scripturis assumam testimonia, quibus eos necesse est credere, de Novo scilicet Testamento. De quo tamen nihil proferam eorum quæ solent immixta esse dicere, cum magnis augustiis coartantur; sed ea dicam, quæ et approbare et laudare coguntur. De M. Ec. Cath. c. i. n. 2.

'they,

‘they, when hardly pressed, are wont to call interpolations: but
‘I shall allege such things only as they both approve and com-
‘mend.’

Every one, I presume, has observed in the history which has been given of their opinions, that they endeavoured to justify their doctrine of two principles, their notion of the person of Christ, and all their peculiar sentiments, by texts of the New Testament. Particularly, when they reject the Old Testament, one of their strongest arguments is taken from it's contrariety to the New. Therefore this last was received, and was of authority with them. The ^d design of the book written by Adimantus, the old disciple of Mani, as Augustine informs us, was to overthrow the Old Testament, by shewing it to be contrary to the evangelical and apostolical scriptures.

Mani, in his letter to Marcellus, ^e complains ‘that men, even ‘Christians, did not believe the gospels.’ And in that same short letter he has words of the gospels of Matthew and John, of the first epistle to the Corinthians, and of the epistle to the Hebrews. And in the ^f dispute with Archelaus he quoted and argued from many passages of the gospels and Paul's epistles. And there are large and numerous quotations of the books of the New Testament in his letter to ^g Menoch, if it be genuine.

Fortunatus, the Manichæan presbyter, in his dispute with Augustine, quotes Philip. ii. 5, in this manner: ‘We ^h think,’ as the apostle directs: and says, ‘he ⁱ knows very well, that he ‘cannot prove his faith to be right, unless he shews it to be ‘agreeable to the scriptures.’

Secundinus, in his letter to Augustine, though of no great length, quotes the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the epistles to the Romans, the Ephesians, and first to Timothy. And in a short compass he owns ^k a great number of facts recorded in the gospels; as Peter's thrice denying his

^d Eodem tempore venerunt in manus meas quædam disputationes Adimanti, —quas conscripsit contra Legem et prophetas, velut contraria eis Evangelica et Apostolica scripta demonstrare conatus. Aug. Retr. l. i. c. 22, in.

^e Ap. Arch. cap: v. p. 6, 7, 8.

^f Ib. c. 13, p. 24, 25, et passim.

^g Ap. Augustin. Op. Imperf. l. 3, c. 177, 180, 185, 186.

^h Hoc sentimus, quod nos instruit beatus Paulus, qui dixit: Fortunat. Disp. i. n. 7.

ⁱ Et quia nullo genere recte me credere ostendere possum, nisi eandem fidem Scripturarum auctoritate firmaverim.

Id. in Disp. ii. n. 20.

^k ———ut et Petrum coegerit sub una nocte tertio Dominum negare, et eidem resurgenti Thomam non permisit credere ———et tanto pastori Iſcariotem raperit; et ut ad ultimum crucis supplicium veniretur, in perniciem ipsius Scribas Phariseosque accenderit, ut Barrabbam dimitti clamarent, et Jesum crucifigi. — Et tamen ne ipso quidem crucis opprobrio potuit satiari. Quin immo insanens hinc coegit spinis coronari, illinc aceto potari: hinc militum lancea percuti, illinc sinistri latronis ore blasphemari. &c. Secundin. ad Aug. cap. 4.

Lord; the final apostasy of Judas; the unbelief of Thomas after our Lord's resurrection; Christ's crucifixion; the Jews preferring Barabbas to Jesus at the instigation of the scribes and pharisees; that Jesus was crowned with thorns, and had vinegar given him to drink; that his side was pierced, and that he was crucified between two thieves, by one of whom he was reviled. He refers also to Hymeneus and Alexander, and other things spoken of by Paul, 1 Tim. i.

Indeed a large part of the New Testament may be found quoted by Faustus, and other Manichees with whom Augustine was concerned, and according to our copies.

Notwithstanding what is said of their charging the catholic Christians with having interpolated the gospels, which will be considered hereafter, Faustus readily says, 'They¹ believe Christ's mystic crucifixion, his saving or wholesome precepts, his parables, and his divine discourses, as related in the gospels.'

And in Faustus alone we find these following, and many other things; our^m Lord's gathering disciples gradually, and not completing at once the number of his apostles; ⁿ his conference with Nicodemus; the^o imprisonment of John the Baptist, his^p message to Jesus, and the answer sent back to him; Peter's^q confession, that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God; that^r unclean spirits crying out owned Jesus to be the Son of God; many^s miracles of our Lord, his curing a man blind from his birth, raising the dead, the woman healed upon touching Christ's garment; the^t history of the centurion, whose servant Christ healed; the^u escape of Barabbas at the petition of the Jews; and the penitent thief, and Christ's acceptance of him; Thomas's^x unbelief, and Christ's shewing him the marks of his wounds; and many other things.

¹ His igitur exceptis, — credimus cætera, præcipue crucis ejus mysticam fixationem, — tum præcepta salutaria ejus, tum parabolæ, cunctumque sermonem deificum. Faust. l. 32, c. 7.

^m Quis hoc testatur dixisse Jesum? Matthæus. Ubi dixisse? In monte. Quibus præsentibus? Petro, Andrea, Jacobo et Joanne, quatuor his tantum. Cæteros enim necdum elegerat, nec ipsum Matthæum. Id. l. 17, cap. i. ⁿ l. 24, c. i.

^o Nam et in ipso Matthæo post inclusum Joannem in carcerem, tunc legitur Jesum cœpisse prædicare evangelium regni Dei. l. 2, c. i. ^p l. 5, c. i.

^q l. 5, c. 3. ^r — quia nec spiritibus immundis, cum iidem Jesum esse filium Dei exserte indissimulanterque con-

siterentur, profuit. — l. 16, c. 1.

^s Nam et cæcum a nativitate lumen videre natura non finit, quod tamen Jesus potenter operatus videtur erga hujus generis cæcos — ? manum aridam sanasse, vocem ac verbum privatis his per naturam redonasse; mortuis et in tabernaculum jam resolutis corporibus compage reddita vitalem redintegrasse spiritum, quem non ad stuporem adducat — ? Quæ tamen omnia nos communiter facta ab eodem credimus Christiani. l. 26, c. 2. ^t l. 33, c. 2.

^u An Barabbas latro ille insignis, qui non solum in ligno suspensus minime est, sed etiam Judæorum rogatu emissus e carcere, magis fuit benedictus, quam ille qui cum Christo de cruce ascendit in cælum? l. 14, c. 1. ^x l. 16, c. 8.

Augustine

Aug.
tombs
word,
had n

Fau
I sh
shewin
Jesus,
the
doctri
in and

VI.
preter
ed, ha
as Au
'they
said n
of the
be ob
far th

1.
ancie
think
in spe
'N
'trin
'righ
Th
ascrib

y Se
tuemin
tis, dic
ea qu
grege
bus in
nich.
testatu
nemo

a U
lis, et
Neq
Christ
in fin.
Sed
se, qu
rint.
Ecc
Evang
T. 8.

Augustine having quoted the histories of the dæmoniacs at the tombs, and of the barren figtree, which withered at Christ's word, particularly observes, that ^y these were things which they had never pretended to be interpolations.

Fauftus, quoting the gospel, calls it ^z scripture.

I shall here ^a in the margin put down a number of passages, shewing the respect which the Manichees had for the apostles of Jesus, though I have before taken notice of some of them. That ^b the apostle Paul should contradict himself, or teach different doctrine at one time, or in one epistle, from what he had taught in another, is a thought which Fauftus rejects with indignation.

VI. What comes to be considered by us in the next place, is, their pretence that the scriptures of the New Testament were corrupted, having been interpolated by the catholics: and therefore, as Augustine said in his summary account, 'they took what they liked, and rejected the rest.' What has been already said may be of some use to help us in understanding this notion of theirs. Nevertheless divers passages of ancient authors should be observed by us, that we may the more distinctly perceive how far they carried this principle.

1. Some might complain if I did not largely transcribe so ancient a writer in this controversy as Titus of Bostra, who, I think, has used the strongest expressions of any of their adversaries in speaking of this matter. They are such as these:

'Mani, and his followers,' he says, 'for ^c supporting their doctrines, quote some texts of scripture, and wrest them from their 'right meaning.'

The ^d Old Testament, even the law and the prophets, he ascribes to what he calls the evil principle. 'The gospels, and

^y Sed quoniam privilegio quodam vos tuemini, ut de scripturis opprimi nequeatis, dicendo eas esse falsatas: quamquam ea quæ commemoravi de arbore, et de grege porcorum, numquam a corruptoribus immissa esse dixistis. De Mor. Manich. c. 17, n. 55.

^z —ut scriptura testatur. Nam pannum, inquit, novum nemo assuit vestimento veteri, &c. l. 8. c. i.

^a Ut fere Christo placet, et ejus Apostolis, et nobis profecto. Faust. l. 24, cap. 1.

Neque id temere aut præsumptive, sed a Christo discentes, et ejus Apostolis. ibid. in fin.

Sed quærendum potius est, quid ipse de se, quidve apostoli sui de eodem prædicarint. Id. l. 19, c. 1.

Ecce quid Apostolus dixit, ecce quid Evangelista. Fel. Act. l. 2, c. 2, ap. Aug. T. 8.

^b Non equidem crediderim

apostolum Dei contraria sibi scribere potuisse, et modo hanc, modo illam de Domino nostro habuisse sententiam.—Alioquin, absit apostolum Dei, quod ædificavit umquam destruere. Faust. l. xi. c. i.^b

^c ῥησις τινὰς τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν ἐκβιάζομενος πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ψευδολογίαν Tit. l. 3, p. 135, f.

^d Τῶν δὲ γραφῶν τὰς μὲν παλαιότητας ἀνατίθει τὴ πρὸς αὐτὴ λεγομένην κακίαν, νόμον τε καὶ προφῆτας· τὰ δὲ εὐαγγελία, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης μαθημάτων, πᾶσα μὲν τὴ ἀγαθὴ, ὡς οἰεταί, δίδασθαι, φησὶν· ὅδε τὰυτα μὴ οὐ τῆς βλασφημίας εὐρετῆς δισχυρίζεται δι' ὅλην καθάρειαν, τὴ, ὡς φησὶν, ἐναντὶ θεοῦ· εὐπαρχει δὲ καὶ τῆτοις, ὥσπερ κατὰ τινὰ μίξιν, πολλὰ τῆς ὑπ' αὐτὴ καθύμνητος ὕλης· καὶ χρῆται ταῦτα, περιέλωτα μοιὰ καθ' αὐτὰ, καταλείπει αὐτὴ τὴ ἀγαθὴ μερίδι. ib. p. 136.

' other

‘other parts of the New Testament,’ he says, ‘are from the good principle; but they are not uncorrupt: for many things of Hyle, or the bad principle, are mixed with them. For which reason we are to make a distinction, and are to follow, and make use of, those parts only which belong to what he calls the good principle.’ He adds, ‘that Mani pretends to correct the holy scriptures, and, acting here the assumed character of the Paraclete, he takes away a large part of the New Testament, and leaves in it a few things only, so spoiling all it’s harmony.’

Titus says farther: ‘Because^f they honour the name of Christ, they pretend to honour also the gospels. But if they did really honour the gospels they would neither take away from them, nor add to them.—Whereas they have added to the gospels what they pleased, and have taken away from them what they thought fit: still calling it the gospel however, when it is not; for they have not the body [or substance] of the gospel.’

Presently afterwards he says that ‘they^g had treated the scriptures worse than the heathens: for they only rejected them, whereas these men, pretending to receive the gospels, have abused, perverted and adulterated them.’

More to the like purpose may be seen in^h Titus. But I suppose I have transcribed enough to satisfy every one concerning the nature of the charge which he brings against this people.

And there is reason to think that he aggravates and exaggerates beyond the truth. Therefore Millⁱ says judiciously, ‘they did not alter the gospels; they only said of those passages, which they did not like, that they were additions, made long ago by some corrupters of the scriptures.’ And Beaufobre^k has shewn largely that Titus has in part misrepresented the case.

* Οὕτω τῶν ἀγίων γραφῶν τὴν διορθώσιν, ὡς οὐταί, καθ’ αὐτοὺς μεταχειρίζομενος, καὶ διὰ τούτο μάλιστ’ αὐτῶν παρακλήτος εἶναι δοκεῖν, τὰ μὲν ὁλοσὸν περιγράφει, βραχέα δὲ καταλιπὼν, καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην ποθέντα τῶν συγγενῶν λόγων τὴν συμφωνίαν· ib. p. 136.

† Ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ τιμῆται τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ, προσποιεῖται· ἰδεῖ γὰρ αὐτὴς, εἴγε τὰ εὐαγγέλια ἱτιμῶν, μὴ περιτεμνέειν τὰ εὐαγγέλια, μὴ μὲρ τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἐξυφελεῖν, μὴ ἑτέρα προσθέσθαι·—προσγίγραφε καὶ γὰρ ὅσα βεβήληνται, καὶ ἐξυφείλαντο ὅσα κειμήσια· καὶ λοιπὸν ὀνοματίζονται·—καλεῖται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μὴ τιτηνηκότες τὸ σῶμα. Tit. l. 3, p. 139.

‡ —οἱ δὲ εὐφραίνονται δοκῶντες, ἐνκατευσαν, ἐνχωρευσαν, ἐνκατηλευσαν τοὺς ἡραμίμας· ib. p. 139.

^b Id. ib. p. 140, 141.

ⁱ Non qui-

dem palam rejectis istis capitulis, sed diffinulatis, seu ita apud animum repudiatis; ut nihilominus cum ab eis premerentur, haud necesse haberent, cum Marcionitis reformare codices suos, sive ex ipsis tollere quæ sibi minus probata fuerint; sed sufficeret dixisse, loca illa jam olim a corruptoribus S. textus fuisse inserta.—Mill. Proleg. n. 726. Gemina istis, ipsiusque textus depravationem objicit Manichæis Titus. Dicit eos circumcidisse Evangelia.—Verum criminatio hæc quousque valeat, et quomodo interpretanda sit, ex supra dictis liquet—non mutantes quidem Scripturas, textumve ipsum quovis modo mutantes. Id. n. 761.

^k Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 302.—309.

Jerom

Jerom intimates either ¹ that the Manichees curtailed the copies of the New Testament, or did not receive and admit the authority of every thing found in the copies generally used by the catholics.

What Photius says of Agapius was observed ^m formerly. He does not expressly charge Agapius with pretending that the books of the New Testament were interpolated.

Augustine often speaks of this matter. Divers of his passages must be produced.

The general account which he gives in his *Retractions* of what he wrote against Faustus, is this: 'I ⁿ wrote a large work against Faustus, blaspheming the law and the prophets, and their God, and the incarnation of Christ, and saying that the scriptures of the New Testament, by which he is confuted, are interpolated.'

He frequently speaks to this purpose: 'When ^o any text is alleged against them from the gospels which they cannot answer, they say it is interpolated.' Again, 'When ^p they are greatly pressed with the authority of the scriptures, they cry out: "That passage was inserted in the gospel by the corrupters of scripture." When ^q the words of scripture are clearly against them, so that they can find no way to pervert them, they betake themselves to their common answer, and say the passage is an interpolation.'

In an epistle to Ceretius, having represented their opinion concerning the Old Testament, he adds: 'And ^r in the canonical scriptures of the New Testament, that is, the genuine evangelical and apostolical writings, they do not receive all, but what they like.—In every book they mark the places, taking such as they think favourable to their errors, and setting aside the rest as interpolations.'

¹ Marcion et Manichæus hunc locum, in quo dicit apostolus, *Quæ quidem sunt allegorica*, et cætera quæ sequuntur, [Gal. iv. 24.] de codice suo tollere noluerunt, putantes adversum nos relinqui. Hier. in Gal. T. 4, p. 281, f.

^m See before, p. 501. ⁿ Contra Faustum Manichæum, blasphemantem Legem et Prophetas, et eorum Deum, et incarnationem Christi; scripturas autem Novi Testamenti, quibus vincitur, falsatas esse dicentem, scripsi grande opus. Retr. l. 2, c. 7. ^o Quod si dicunt, hoc capitulum falsum esse, et a corruptoribus scripturarum esse additum; (nam hoc solent, quando non inveniunt quid respondeant, dicere:) Contr. Adim. cap. 3, n. 2.

^p An forte dicturi sunt, sicut solent di-

cere, cum scripturarum eos urget auctoritas; hoc capitulum a corruptoribus scripturarum insertam esse Evangelio? Contr. Adim. c. 13, n. 1, m. ^q Hoc est quod paulo ante dixi, quia ubi sic manifesta veritate isti præfocantur, ut obesi dilucidis verbis sanctarum scripturarum, exitum in eis fallacie suæ reperire non possint, id testimonium quod prolaturum est, falsum esse respondent. Contr. Faust. l. xi. c. 2.

^r Qui etiam in scripturis canonicis testamenti novi, hoc est, in veris Evangelicis et Apostolicis literis, non accipiunt omnia, sed quod volunt.—Sed et in singulis quibusque libris loca distinguunt quæ putant suis erroribus convenire, cætera in eis pro falsis habent. Ad. Ceret. Ep. 237, al. 253.

He somewhere calls this^s a certain privilege of theirs, by which they endeavoured to defend themselves against arguments brought from a text of scripture.

In another place he says: 'This^t is their principle—What^e ever is found in the gospels, or in the epistles, by which they^e imagine their error may be supported, that they allow and maintain to have been said by Christ and his apostles: what^e ever appears contrary to them in the same books they make no scruple to say, without shame, has been inserted by some corrupters of scripture. By which diabolical privilege of theirs they think themselves secure against every thing that can be alleged from scripture.'

Hence we learn that, according to them, the apostolical epistles, as well as the gospels, had been corrupted.

He elsewhere says that 'they^u receive and approve some things in the books of the New Testament: and that when asked, why they rejected and found fault with other things in the same books, they answered, because those passages had been inserted by corrupters of the scripture.'

Augustine intimates that^{*} this principle was taught by Mani himself, 'to accept whatever favoured him in the New Testament, and reject what did not.'

It is found in The Acts of Archelaus. That^y bishop argued in favour of the Old Testament from those words of Christ, Matt. v. 17: *I came not to destroy, but to fulfil.* To which Mani answers, that 'Christ never spoke those words. For since in fact he destroyed the law, we ought to conclude his discourses agreed therewith.'

^s Sed quoniam privilegio quodam vos tuemini, ut de scripturis opprimi nequeatis, dicendo eas esse falsatas. De M. Manich. c. 17, n. 55.

^t An forte, quæ de Novo Testamento protulimus, ipsa quoque audent dicere falsa esse atque perversa, privilegio suo diabolico, ut quicquid est in Evangelio vel Epistolis canonicis, quo adjuvari hæresim suam putent, id esse a Christo et apostolis dictum teneant atque suadeant, quicquid autem ex iisdem codicibus adversus eos sonuerit, immissum ab infalsatoribus, ore impudenti ac sacrilego non dubitent dicere? Cui furori eorum, auctoritatem omnium librorum extinguere atque abolere conanti, jam supra — non pauca respondi. Contr. Faust. l. 22. c. 15.

^u Vos scripturas Novi Testamenti tamquam falsatas corruptasque pulsatis. — Vos autem omnia quæ in libris Novi Testamenti non accipitis omnino reprehendi-

tis, nec a Christo, nec ab apostolis ejus dicta vel conscripta asseveratis. — Cum itaque a vobis quaeritur, quare non omnia in libris Novi Testamenti accipitis, sed in eis libris, in quibus approbatis aliqua, multa respuitis, reprehenditis, accusatis, a corruptoribus inserta esse contenditis. Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 8.

^y Nam sicut te Manichæus impiam docuit perversitatem, ut ex evangelio quod hæresim tuam non impedit accipias, quod autem non impedit, non accipias. Contr. Faust. l. 18, c. 7.

^z Ego audiens dicebam eis sermonem evangelicum, quomodo dixit Dominus noster Jesus Christus, *Non veni solvere legem, sed implere.* Ille vero ait, nequaquam eum hoc dixisse sermonem. Cum enim ipsam inveniamus eum resolvisse legem, necesse est nos hoc potius intelligere quod fecit. Arch. c. 40, p. 69.

The

The same thing is implied in some charges ² of Archelaus against Mani.

And Faustus speaks of it ^a as the common Manichæan doctrine, and ^b taught them by their master.

2. There is a long paragraph of Faustus upon this point, which I shall transcribe largely. I need not insert it all here, because there are in it many tautologies: but I shall endeavour to represent the whole of his argument in his own words.

Says this Manichæan bishop: 'If ^c you receive the gospel, you ought to receive all things written therein. And do you, who receive also the Old Testament, believe every thing written therein? Excepting the prophecies concerning the king of the Jews, who was to come, whom you take to be Jesus, and some moral precepts, you no more value it than Paul does, who considers it as dung. Why then may not I do the like with the New Testament—take what is right and conducive to my salvation, and reject those things which have been fraudulently foisted in by your ancestors, and disfigure it, and spoil it's beauty and excellence?

'And ^d how much more allowable is it for us to take this method, since it is certain that the New Testament was not written by Christ himself, nor by his apostles, but a long while after

² — et in nostris libris, sicut etiam adversus me disputans fecit, assertionem suam proferre, quædam in his accusans, quædam permutans, solo Christi nomine adjecto. Arch. cap. 54, p. 99.

^a Et tamen me quidem jam adversus capituli hujus necessitudinem Manichæa fides reddidit tutum, quæ principio mihi non cuncta quæ ex salvatoris nomine scripta leguntur, passim credere persuasit. Faust. l. 18, c. 3.

^b Quare indeficientes ego preceptori meo refero gratias, qui me similiter labentem retinuit. &c. Id. l. 19, c. 5, in.

^c Si accipis evangelium, credere omnia debes, quæ in eodem scripta sunt. Quid enim tu, quia vetus accipis testamentum, idcircone credis omnia passim, quæ in eodem scripta sunt? Nempe solas indidem excerptes prophetias, quæ regem Judæis venturum significabant, quia ipsum putatis esse Jesum; et pauca quædam disciplinæ civilis præcepta communia, ut est, non occides, non mœchaberis, cætera præmittitis, et arbitramini, esse non minus atque eadem quæ Paulus putavit stercorea. Quid ergo peregrinum hoc, aut quid mirum est, si ego de testamento novo purissima quæque legens et meæ salutis convenientia, præmitto quæ a vestris majoribus in-

ducta fallaciter, et majestatem ipsius et gratiam decolorant? Faust. l. 32, cap. i.

^d — præsertim quod nec ab ipso scriptum constat, nec ab ejus apostolis, sed longo post tempore a quibusdam incerti nominis viris, qui ne sibi non haberetur fides, scribentibus quæ nescirent, partim apostolorum, partim eorum qui apostolos secuti viderentur, scriptorum suorum frontibus indiderunt, asseverantes secundum eos se scripsisse quæ scripserunt. Quo magis mihi videntur injuria gravi affecisse discipulos Christi: quia quæ dissona iidem et repugnantia sibi scriberent, ea referrent ad ipsos, et secundum eos hæc scribere se profiterentur evangelia, quæ tantis sint referta erroribus, tantis contrarietatibus narrationum simul ac sententiarum, ut nec sibi prorsus, nec inter se ipsa conveniant. Quid ergo aliud est, quam calumniari bonos, et Christi discipulorum concordem coetum in crimen devocare discordiæ? Quæ quia nos legentes animadvertimus, cordis obtutu sanissimo æquissimum judicavimus, utilibus acceptis ex iisdem, id est, iis quæ et fidem nostram ædificent, et Christi Domini atque ejus Patris omnipotentis Dei propagent gloriam, cætera repudiare, quæ nec ipsorum majestati, nec fidei nostræ convenient, ib. c. 2.

‘ their time by some unknown persons; who, lest they should not
 ‘ be credited when they wrote of affairs they were little ac-
 ‘ quainted with, affixed to their works the names of apostles, or
 ‘ of such as were supposed to have been their companions, and
 ‘ saying they were written by them? Whereby, in my opinion,
 ‘ they have greatly injured the disciples of Christ, making them
 ‘ the authors of books in which there are many errors and con-
 ‘ tradictions. For is not this to abuse the disciples of Jesus,
 ‘ who certainly agreed, and were all of one mind? We, perceiv-
 ‘ ing this, have taken the only reasonable method; which is to ex-
 ‘ amine every thing according to the rules of sound reason and
 ‘ judgment, accepting those things which are useful for establish-
 ‘ ing our faith, and are honourable to the Lord Jesus Christ and
 ‘ Almighty God his Father, and rejecting all other things which
 ‘ are not for his honour nor our benefit.’

‘ Whether the prophets prophesied of Jesus will be confi-
 ‘ dered hereafter. In the mean time I say, if Jesus, foretold in
 ‘ the Old Testament, teaches that some things in it are to be re-
 ‘ ceived, and many others rejected, in like manner the Com-
 ‘ forter, promised in the New Testament, teaches us what of it
 ‘ we ought to receive and what to reject. Of whom Jesus, when
 ‘ he promised him, says in the gospel: *He shall lead you into all*
 ‘ *truth, and teach you all things, and bring all things to your remem-*
 ‘ *brance:* John xvi. 13. Why therefore may not we do the same
 ‘ with the New Testament, through the Comforter, that you do
 ‘ with the Old by Jesus?—especially, since, as before said, it
 ‘ was not written by Christ, nor by his apostles.’

‘ To conclude therefore, as you in the Old take only the
 ‘ prophecies

— Sed an prophetæ Jesum præ-
 sagiverint, postea videbimus. Interim ad
 hæc me respondere oportet, quia si Jesus,
 per testamentum vetus annunciat, nunc
 dijudicat et carminat, docetque pauca ejus
 accipienda esse, repudianda vero quam
 plurima; et nobis Paracletus ex Novo Tes-
 tamento promissus perinde docet, quid ac-
 cipere ex eodem debeamus, et quid repu-
 diare: de quo ultro Jesus, cum eum pro-
 mitteret, dicit in Evangelio: Ipse vos in-
 ducet in omnem veritatem, et ipse vobis
 annuntiabit omnia, et commemorabit vos.
 Quapropter liceat tantum et nobis in Tes-
 tamento Novo per Paracletum, quantum
 vobis in vetere licere ostenditis per Jesum:
 — præsertim quod nec a Christo scrip-
 tum constat, ut diximus, nec ab ejus apos-
 tolis. ib. c. 6.

Quapropter ut vos
 ex vetere testamento solas admittitis pro-

phetias, et illa quæ superius diximus ci-
 vilia atque ad disciplinam vitæ communis
 pertinentia præcepta; supersedistis vero
 peritomen, et sacrificia, et sabbathum et
 observationem ejus, et azyma: quid ab re
 est, si et nos de Testamento Novo sola acci-
 pientes ea, quæ in honorem et laudem filii
 maiestatis vel ab ipso dicta comperimus,
 vel ab ejus apostolis, sed jam perfectis ac
 fidelibus, dissimulavimus cætera, quæ aut
 simplices tunc et ignoranter a rudibus
 dicta, aut oblique et maligne ab inimicis
 objecta, aut impudenter a scriptoribus af-
 firmata, et posteris tradita: dico autem hoc
 ipsum natum ex femina turpiter, circumci-
 sum judaice, sacrificasse gentiliter, baptiza-
 tum humaniter, circumductum a diabolo
 per desertum, et ab eo tentatum quam miser-
 rime. His igitur exceptis, et si quid ei ab
 scriptoribus ex testamento vetere falsa sub-
 tes-

‘ pr
 ‘ an
 ‘ br
 ‘ th
 ‘ fa
 ‘ an
 ‘ th
 ‘ an
 ‘ of
 ‘ he
 ‘ mi
 ‘ qu
 ‘ wr
 ‘ fix
 ‘ as
 ‘ di
 ‘ th
 ‘ I
 ‘ latin
 ‘ fer
 ‘ of
 ‘ wo
 ‘ th
 ‘ wr
 ‘ by
 ‘ ed
 ‘ wi
 ‘ na
 ‘ he c
 ‘ wi
 ‘ ju
 ‘ at
 ‘ S

testifi
 praci
 qua
 vulne
 parab
 cum,
 rarun
 in du
 § N
 turas
 quan
 asseri
 cum
 utru

‘prophecies and moral precepts; and have rejected circumcision, and sacrifices, and the sabbath, and it’s rest, and unleavened bread; what absurdity is there, if we also receive in the New those things only which we find to the honour of the Son, and said by himself or his apostles, but perfect and fully instructed; and reject other things said by them [that is, the apostles] in their ignorance, or falsely and impudently ascribed to them, and since handed about as theirs? I mean that Jesus was born of a woman, circumcised like a Jew; that he sacrificed like a heathen, was meanly baptized, led about in the wilderness, and miserably tempted by the devil. Excepting these, and the quotations of the Old Testament, fraudulently inserted by those writers, we receive all the rest; especially his mystical crucifixion, in which are manifested the wounds of our own souls; as also his salutary precepts, and his parables, and all his divine discourses, teaching the difference of two natures, of which there can be no doubt but they are his.’

I put in the margin § another passage of Faustus, without translating it exactly, where he pretends that ‘there are many differences and contrarieties in the gospels; and that the ancestors of the catholics had inserted many things, mingling their own words with the oracles of the Lord, which did not agree with the doctrine taught by him; and that the gospels were not written by Christ, nor his apostles, but a long while after them by some unknown men, half-Jews, who were not well informed, but put down any uncertain traditions which they met with; and then affixed to their own erroneous accounts the names of Christ’s apostles or their companions.’ From all which he concludes, that ‘men ought never to hear or read the gospels without caution, trying all things by their own reason and judgment, and admitting nothing but what, after strict examination, is found to be right.’

Such is the substance of a paragraph in the thirty-third and

testificatione injectum est, credimus cetera; præcipue crucis ejus mysticam fixationem, qua nostræ animæ passionis monstrantur vulnera; tum præcepta salutaria ejus, tum parabolæ, cunctumque sermonem deificum, qui maxime duarum præferens naturarum discretionem, ipsius esse non venit in dubium. ib. c. 7.

§ Nec immerito nos ad hujusmodi scripturas tam inconsonantes et varias, nunquam sane sine judicio ac ratione aures asserimus: sed contemplantes omnia, et cum aliis aliâ conferentes, perpendimus utrum eorum quidque a Christo dici potu-

erit necne. Multa enim a majoribus vestris eloquiis Domini nostri inserta verba sunt, quæ nomine signata ipsius cum ejus fide non congruant: præsertim, quia, ut jam sæpe probatum a nobis est, nec ab ipso hæc sunt, nec ab ejus apostolis scripta; sed multo post eorum assumptionem a nescio quibus et ipsis inter se non concordantibus semi-judæis per famas opinionisque comperta sunt: qui tamen omnia eadem in apostolorum Domini conferentes nomina, vel eorum qui secuti apostolos viderentur, errores ac mendacia sua secundum eos se scripsisse mentiti sunt. Id. l. 33, c. 3.

last book of the work of Faustus, so far at least as it is given us by Augustine.

I refer likewise ^h in the margin to a place or two more, where he speaks somewhat distinctly of this matter.

VII. It is fit we should now make some remarks upon these passages.

1. It appears hence, that Augustine's account upon this head is just and right. The Manichees, or however those of Africa, took what they liked in the New Testament, and rejected what did not suit them. So Faustus evidently.

2. As for what Faustus says of the catholics not receiving every thing in the Old Testament, Augustine well answers, that ⁱ they received every thing therein as of divine original and appointment; and allowed all things to be right for the time; those which they did not now follow, as well as the laws of true and real righteousness, by which they were still obliged. I have transcribed several passages of Augustine at the bottom of the page, supposing that they will not be disagreeable to the reader.

3. The Manichees, or however Faustus and his friends, denied that the gospels were written by the apostles and evangelists whose names they bear. Mr. Nye ^k gives a different account of the sentiment of our Manichæan author. But it is manifest that Faustus speaks of the books of the New Testament commonly received by catholic Christians, or at least of the gospels. Beaufobre ^l is sensible of it, and speaking of this subject says, 'they denied the gospels to have been written by the sacred authors whose names they bear; and denied it with surprising rashness and assurance.'

4. Hence we perceive what in the gospels the Manichees received, and what not. They received our Lord's discourses and

^h Vid. Faust. l. 18, c. 3, l. 19, c. 5.

ⁱ Nos Veteris Testamenti scripturas omnes, ut dignum est, veras divinasque laudamus. — Nos ea quæ nunc de libris Testamenti Veteris non observamus, congruenter tamen illo tempore atque illi populo fuisse præcepta — offendimus et docemus. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 8, in.

Quæcunque scripta sunt in illis libris Veteris Testamenti omnia verissime atque utilissime pro æterna vita scripta esse laudamus, accipimus, approbamus: Sed quæ in his mandata corporali operatione non observamus, et rectissime tunc mandata intelligimus, et umbras futurorum esse didicimus, et nunc impleri cognoscimus. Id. ib. c. 14.

Hoc enim aliqua veri-simili ratione di-

ceretur, si esset aliquid in Veteris Testamenti libris, quod nos diceremus non recte dictum, non divinitus jussum, non veraciter scriptum. Nihil horum dicimus, sed accipimus omnia, sive quæ observamus, ut recte vivamus; sive quæ non observamus, ut tamen et ipsa tunc in prophetia jussa et observata nunc jam compleri videamus. Id. ib. cap. 15.

^k See Steph. Nye's Defence of the Canon of the New Testament. p. 94—100.

^l Nos herétiques ayant supposé, que les Evangiles n'avoient été écrits par des Apôtres, ni par de disciples des Apôtres, mais par des inconnus à dem-juifs, &c. Beauf. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 299. See also p. 296,

parables; the history of his preaching, miracles, crucifixion, and every thing else, excepting some few things most evidently contrary to their notions; as our Lord's nativity, circumcision, and the quotations from the Old Testament. Some might be apt to think they must have set aside a very large part of the New Testament, as interpolated: but from this passage of Faustus himself, and from many things already alleged, it may be perceived ^m that would be a wrong conclusion.

5. We see the ground and occasion of the liberty they took in censuring the New Testament, particularly the gospels. They had certain philosophical principles of which they were too fond; and therefore they would rather say any thing than give them up. They would not give up their particular notions. Nor did they dare to deny the authority of Christ or his apostles. The only refuge left them therefore was to say that the books of the New Testament were not written by apostles, or that they were interpolated. Perhaps it might have been sufficient to say this last: possibly that is all that was said by some of the sect. But Faustus is pleased to say both, rather than presume to contradict Christ or his apostles, or insinuate that their doctrine was in any thing wrong. Augustine has a ⁿ remark to the same purpose handsomely expressed.

6. The Manichæan scheme, as here represented by Faustus, is inconsistent and overthrows itself. The gospels in some things are good authority, in others not. The gospels, he says, were not written by Christ, nor his apostles, nor apostolical men: but by some unknown people a good while after their times. Nor were those writers well acquainted with the affairs of which they have written. And yet they are, it seems, good witnesses to Christ's miracles, parables, divine discourses, and mystical crucifixion. Faustus too claims an interest in the promise of the Spirit, made by Christ; though he knows nothing of that promise but from the gospels. Augustine has well shewn the inconsistency of this scheme. 'If ^o the books of the New Testament 'are genuine and right,' says he, 'your doctrine is overthrown: 'and if they are not so, but spurious and fallacious, your princi-

^m His autem exceptis, et testimoniis ex Veteri Testamento, quæ illis inserta sunt literis, cætera vos, secundum id quod Faustus loquitur, fatemini accipere. Aug. Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 19.

ⁿ Vos ergo jam dicite, quare non accipatis omnia ex libris Novi Testamenti? utrum quia non sunt apostolorum Christi, an quia pravi aliquid docuerunt Apostoli Christi? Respondebunt, quia non sunt

apostolorum Christi. Nam illa vox altera Paganorum est, qui dicunt apostolos Christi non recta docuisse. Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 16, in.

^o Ita ergo aut cogimini veraces illos codices conteri, et continuo evertent hæresim vestram: aut si fallaces eos dixeritis, eadem auctoritate Paracletum non poteritis asserere, et vos evertitis hæresim vestram. Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 16, in.

‘ple is in like manner overthrown. For you have no other authority to go upon.’

Some may think their principle led them to pay little regard to scripture. And they may be apprehensive that there was nothing in the New Testament they relied upon as certainly genuine and said by Christ, or written by his apostles. But if that be the consequence of their principle, they did not see it. We must rather say, therefore, that they were absurd and inconsistent. For that the scriptures of the New Testament were in esteem and authority with them, must be apparent to all who have read the preceding part of this history. And it is as evident that they were well satisfied of the genuineness of some parts of the New Testament, though they affirmed other things to be interpolations. Otherwise those books could have been of no use. Moreover we just now observed Faustus to say of our Lord’s divine discourses and parables: ‘There can be no doubt but they are his.’ They received therefore many things in the New Testament, yea the main part of it, as unquestionably genuine. These are words of Secundinus to Augustine: ‘And ^p is that saying blotted out of the gospel, *Broad is the way that leads to destruction?* or is not that text in Paul genuine, *that every one must give an account of himself?*’

And Augustine supposes that he argues very cogently when he reminds them that, ^q so far as they weaken the credit of the scriptures, they weaken the proofs of their own particular principles, built thereon. They ^r likewise hazarded even their Christianity. They weaken, he tells them, and in a manner overthrow the grounds and evidences upon which they believe in Jesus, or would persuade others to believe in him: such as the history of his words and works, and the divine appearances in his favour, recorded in the gospels.

7. The arguments they make use of for shewing that the gospels were not written by apostles, or are interpolated, are insufficient.

^p An emendatum in Evangelio est, quod spatiosa via non ducat in interitum? An falsum in Paulo est, quod operum singulorum erunt reddituri rationem? Secundinus. ad Aug. c. 3. ^q Unde asseritis personam vestri auctoris, vel potius deceptoris? Respondetis, Ex Evangelio vos probare. Ex quo Evangelio? quod non totum accipitis, quod falsatum esse vos dicitis. Quis ergo testem suum prius ipse dicat falsitate esse corruptum, et tunc producat ad testimonium? Contr. Faust. l. 32,

c. 16. Vid. ib. l. 13, c. 4, 5.

^r Vocem Patris de cælo non audistis, opera Christi, quibus de seipso testificabatur, non vidistis, codices in quibus hæc scripta sunt, ut specie Christiana fallatis, velut accipitis; ne tamen contra vos legantur, infalsatos dicitis. ib. l. 13, c. 5. Sed tamen si Paganus in Novo Testamento talia reprehenderet, qualia isti reprehendunt in vetere, nonne et ipsi ea defendenda susciperent? &c. ib. l. 22, c. 14.

They

They are such as these: That there are in the gospels many things which are absurd and contrary to reason. But that is false: every thing in the gospels is right and reasonable.

Again they say that the evangelists disagree, and that there are contrarieties in the accounts of things contained in the gospels: which too is false, as Augustine well observes. If^s they cannot reconcile these several accounts, it is for want of skill and attention, or it is owing to prejudice. Again, says Augustine: Let^t them study the gospels more, and let them come with a pious disposition, and judge with the candour required in reading and comparing other historians, who have severally written of like matters, and all will be easy.

As for any pretensions to the Spirit, they gave no proofs of their having a greater interest in him than other Christians had. Therefore, if their reason and judgment failed them, as they evidently did in this matter, their whole argument is desperate, and of no value. Augustine has spoken^u to this particular likewise.

8. Their principle was arbitrary. They said the scriptures used by the catholics were corrupted. They^x should then, as Augustine well observes, produce other copies more correct, where were the things they allowed and contended for as right; whilst the other things, insisted on by the catholics in arguing against them, were wanting. But they produced no such copies, nor ever pretended to have any different from those commonly used.

Augustine has very agreeably and thoroughly exposed them

^s Vos ergo quid dicitis? Unde ostenditis scripturas illas non ab apostolis ministratas? Respondetis, quia multa sunt in eis et inter se et sibi contraria. Omnino falsissimum est, vos non intelligitis. — Quis enim ferat lectorem, vel auditorem, scripturam tantæ auctoritatis facilius quam vitium suæ tarditatis audere culpæ? Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 16.

^t Sed contraria, inquit, inter se scripta eorum reperiuntur. Maligni malo studio legitis, stulti non intelligitis, cæci non videtis. Quid enim magnum erat ista diligenter inspicere, et eorumdem scriptorum magnam et salubrem invenire congruentiam, si vos contentio non perverteret, et si pietas adjuvaret! Quis enim umquam duos historicos legens de una re scribentes, utrumque vel utrumlibet eorum aut fallere aut falli arbitratus est, si unus eorum dixit quod alius prætermisit; aut si alter

aliquid brevius complexus est, &c.? Contr. Faust. l. 33, c. 7.

^u An hoc dicitis vos Paracletum docuisse, Scripturas istas Apostolorum non esse, sed sub eorum nominibus ab aliis esse conscriptas? Hoc saltem docete, ipsum Paracletum esse, a quo didicistis hæc apostolorum non esse. Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 16.

^x Proferendus est namque tibi alius codex eadem continens, et tamen incorruptus et verior, ubi sola desint ea quæ hic immissa esse criminari. Ut si, verbi causa, Pauli epistolam, quæ ad Romanos est, corruptam esse contendis, aliam proferas incorruptam, vel alium codicem potius, in quo ejusdem Apostoli eadem epistola sincera et incorrupta sit. Non faciam, inquis, ne ipse corrupisse credar. Hoc enim soletis, dicere. Et verum dicitis, &c. De Mor. Ec. Cath. cap. 29, n. 61.

upon

upon this head in a ^y passage which I transcribe in his own words at the bottom of the page.

9. That the several books of the New Testament were written by apostles, or apostolical men, that is, by the persons whose names they bear, is evident from the testimony of all Christians in general, who lived before the time of Faustus and Mani.

10. The charge against the catholics is false and groundless. Neither they, nor their ancestors, had corrupted and interpolated the scriptures of the New Testament. Some faults may have crept into them: and lesser differences there will be in copies of books often transcribed: but no considerable alterations could be made in writings so much valued, so well known, in the hands of so many persons, preserved in their original language, and translated likewise into many other languages.

On these two last observations, which contain the main answer to all the Manichæan pretences and objections relating to the books of the New Testament, Augustine has insisted largely, and admirably, in his confutations of the Manichees, and elsewhere. I am sure my readers will be pleased to see what he has said; and therefore I intend to transcribe several of his passages.

1. In a letter to Jerom, Augustine writes to this purpose: 'The ^z Manichees pretend that many passages of the divine scriptures, by which their impious opinions are clearly confuted, and which therefore they cannot wrest to their purpose, are not right: which wrong things however they do not ascribe to the apostles, but to some unknown corrupters of the same scriptures. But since they cannot justify themselves by the more numerous, nor more ancient copies, nor by the authority of the original language, from which the Latin copies have been translated, their foolish assertion is easily confuted.'

2. In his book to his friend Honoratus, Augustine observes:

^y Aliud est ergo auctoritate aliquorum vel librorum vel hominum non teneri, et aliud est dicere, Iste quidem vir sanctus omnia vera scripsit, et ista epistola ipsius est, sed in ea ipsa hoc ejus est, hoc non est ejus. Ubi cum ex adverso audieris, Proba; non confugies ad exempla veriora, vel plurium codicum, vel antiquorum, vel linguæ præcedentis, unde hoc in aliam linguam interpretatum est: sed dicas, Inde proba hoc illius esse, illud non esse, quia hoc pro me sonat, illud contra me. Tu es ergo regula veritatis? &c. Contr. Faust. l. xi. c. 2.

^z Manichæi plurima divinarum scripturarum, quibus eorum nefarius error clarissima sententiarum perspicuitate convincitur, quia in alium sensum detorquere non possunt, falsa esse contendunt: ita tamen ut eam falsitatem non scribentibus apostolis tribuant, sed nescio quibus codicum corruptoribus. Quod tamen quia nec pluribus, nec antiquioribus exemplaribus, nec præcedentis linguæ auctoritate, unde Latini libri interpretati sunt, probare aliquando potuerunt, notissima omnibus veritate superati confusique discedunt. Aug. Ep. 82, [al. 19] n. 6.

' Their

‘ Their ^a opinion is, that some unknown men, who were desirous to mix the law with the gospel, had interpolated the scriptures of the New Testament before the time of Mani. ‘ But,’ says he ‘ this opinion of theirs always appeared to me ‘ extremely absurd and unreasonable. It appeared so to me ‘ when I was among them; and not to me only but to you, and ‘ to others also who had any good degree of understanding. ‘ But I am now still more persuaded of the egregious folly of ‘ such an opinion, since they cannot make it out by the difference ‘ of the copies of scripture.’

3. In another place Augustine says, ‘ the ^b books of scripture could not be corrupted. If such an attempt had been ‘ made by any one, his design would have been prevented and ‘ defeated. His alterations would have been immediately detected by many and more ancient copies. The difficulty of ‘ succeeding in such an attempt is apparent hence, that the scriptures were early translated into divers languages, and copies of ‘ them were numerous. The alterations, which any one attempted to make, would have been soon perceived: just even as now,’ says he ‘ in fact, lesser faults in some copies are amended by ‘ comparing ancient copies, or those of the original language.’

4. And soon afterwards he says: ‘ According ‘ to your way ‘ of proceeding, the authority of scripture is quite destroyed; ‘ and every one’s fancy is to determine what in the scriptures ‘ ought to be received, what not. He does not admit it because ‘ it is found in writings of so great credit and authority; but it is ‘ rightly written because it is agreeable to his judgment. Into

^a Volunt enim nescio quos corruptores divinatorum librorum ante ipsius Manichæi tempora fuisse: corrupisse autem illos, qui Judæorum legem evangelio miscere cupiebant. De Ut. Cred. c. 3, n. 7, sub f. Quæ vox mihi semper quidem, etiam cum eos audirem, invalidissima visa est: nec mihi soli, sed etiam tibi, (nam bene memini,) et nobis omnibus, qui paulo majorem diligentiam in judicando habere conabamur, quam turba credentium. Nunc vero— nihil mihi videtur ab eis impudentius dici, vel ut mitius loquar, incuriosius et imbecillius, quam scripturas divinas esse corruptas: cum id nullis in tam recenti memoria exstantibus exemplaribus possint convincere. ib. n. 7, init.

^b — quid faceretis, dicite mihi, nisi clamaretis, nullo modo vos potuisse falsare codices, qui jam in manibus essent omnium Christianorum? quia mox ut facere cepissetis, vetustiorum exemplarium veritate convinceremini. Qua igitur causa

a vobis corrumpi non possent, hac causa a nemine potuerunt. Quisquis enim hoc primitus ausus esset, multorum codicum vetustiorum collatione confutaretur: maxime, quia non una lingua sed multis eadem scriptura contineretur. Nam etiamnum nonnullæ codicum mendositates vel de antiquioribus, vel de lingua præcedente emendantur. Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 16, f.

^c Videtis ergo id vos agere, ut omnis de medio Scripturarum auferatur auctoritas, et suus cuique animus auctor sit, quid in quaque Scriptura probet, quid improbet, id est, ut non auctoritati Scripturarum subijciatur ad fidem, sed sibi Scripturas ipse subijciat: non ut ideo illi placeat aliquid, quia hoc in sublimi auctoritate scriptum legitur; sed ideo recte scriptum videatur, quia hoc illi placuit. Quo te committis, anima misera—? Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 19.

‘ what

‘ what confusion and uncertainty must men be brought by such
‘ a principle!’

5. In a passage, which ^d I place at the bottom of the page, Augustine shews admirably that by their way of reasoning the credit of all sorts of writings, the most authentic, the best attested, the most generally received, is weakened, and even reduced to nothing.

6. Again: ‘ If,’ says ^e he, ‘ you receive abundance of fabulous
‘ things upon the authority of Mani, because found in his writings,
‘ though there is no demonstration of the truth, and his autho-
‘ rity is very obscure; is it not much more reasonable to believe
‘ the things contained in the scriptures of the New Testament,
‘ which are so well known, and have been transmitted down from
‘ the time of the apostles with an universal, uninterrupted tra-
‘ dition? And if the things therein delivered are contrary to your
‘ sentiments, you should conclude your sentiments to be wrong,
‘ and should correct them by the scriptures.’

7. Augustine argues likewise in this manner: ‘ If ^f you here
‘ ask us, how we know these to be the writings of the apos-
‘ tles; in brief we answer, in the same way that you know the
‘ epistles, or any other writings of Mani, to be his: for if any
‘ one should be pleased to dispute with you, and offer to deny

^d Quid hoc loco potest dicere impuden-
tissima pertinacia? Non hoc Christum dix-
isse? At in Evangelio verba ejus ista con-
scripta sunt. Falsum esse scriptum? Quod
hoc sacrilegio magis impium reperiri po-
test? quid ista voce impudentius? quid
audacius? quid sceleratius? Simulachro-
rum cultores, qui Christi etiam nomen
oderunt, numquam hoc adversus Scrip-
turas illas ausi sunt dicere. Consequetur
namque omnium literarum summa per-
versio, et omnium qui memorie mandati
sunt librorum abolitio; si quod tanta po-
pulorum religione roboratum est, tanta
hominum et temporum consensione firma-
tum, in hanc dubitationem inducitur, ut
ne historie quidem vulgaris fidem possit
gravitatemque obtinere. De Mor. Ecc.
Cath. c. 29, n. 60.

^e Plene, inquis, Manichæus me docuit.
Sed infelix, credidisti, neque enim vidisti.
Si ergo ad millia fabulorum phantasma-
tum, quibus turpiter gravidatus es, te auc-
toritati ignotissimæ—subdidisti, ut ideo
hæc omnia crederes, quia in illis conscrip-
ta sunt libris, quibus miserabili errore cre-
dendum esse censuisti, cum tibi nulla de-
monstrentur: cur non potius Evangelicæ
auctoritati, tam fundatæ, tam stabilitæ,
tanta gloria diffusatæ, atque ab Aposto-

lorum temporibus usque ad nostra tem-
pora per successiones certissimas commen-
datæ; non te subdis, ut credas, ut videas,
ut discas etiam omnia quæ te offendant,
ex vana et perversa opinione te offendere.
Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 19.

^f Hic jam si queratis a nobis, nos unde
sciamus Apostolorum esse istas literas: bre-
viter vobis respondemus, inde nos scire,
unde et vos scitis illas literas esse Mani-
chæi, quas miserabiliter huic auctoritati
præponitis. Si enim et hinc vobis aliquis
moveat quæstionem, et scrupulum con-
tradictionis impingat, dicens, libros quos
profertis Manichæi, non esse Manichæi,
quid facturi estis? Nonne potius ejus de-
braimenta ridebitis, qui contra rem tanta
connexionis et successionis serie confirma-
tam, impudentiam hujus vocis emittat?
Sicut ergo certum est, illos libros esse Ma-
nichæi, et omnino ridendus est, qui ex
transverso veniens tanto post natus litem
vobis hujus contradictionis intenderit; ita
certum est, Manichæum, vel Manichæos
esse ridendos, aut etiam dolendos, qui tam
fundatæ auctoritati, a temporibus Aposto-
lorum usque ad hæc tempora certis suc-
cessionibus custoditæ atque perductæ, au-
deant tale aliquid dicere: Ib. cap. 21.

‘ the

‘the epistles ascribed to Mani to be his, what would you do?
 ‘Would you not laugh at the assurance of the man who denied
 ‘the genuineness of writings generally allowed? As therefore
 ‘it is certain those books are Mani’s, and he would be ridicu-
 ‘lous who should now dispute it; so certain is it that the Mani-
 ‘chees deserve to be laughed at, or rather ought to be pitied,
 ‘who dispute the truth and genuineness of those writings of the
 ‘apostles, which have been handed down as theirs from their
 ‘time to this through an uninterrupted succession of well known
 ‘witnesses.’

§. Augustine says farther that, ‘following § their principle,
 ‘there must be an end to all authority and certainty in all writ-
 ‘ings whatever. For no writings ever had a better testimony
 ‘afforded them than those of the apostles and evangelists. Nor
 ‘does it weaken the credit and authority of books, received by
 ‘the church of Christ from the beginning, that some other writ-
 ‘ings have been without ground, and falsely ascribed to the
 ‘apostles. For the like has happened, for instance, to Hippo-
 ‘crates; but yet his genuine works are distinguished from others
 ‘which have been published under his name. We know the
 ‘writings of the apostles as we know the works of Plato, Aristo-
 ‘tle, Cicero, Varro, and others, to be theirs, and as we know

§ Infelices inimici animæ vestræ, quæ
 umquam literæ ullum habebunt pondus
 auctoritatis, si Evangelicæ, si Apostolicæ
 non habebunt? De quo libro certum erit
 cuius sit, si literæ quas Apostolorum dicit
 et tenet ecclesia ab ipsis Apostolis propa-
 gata et per omnes gentes tanta eminentia
 declarata, utrum Apostolorum sint, incer-
 tum est—? Quasi vero et in literis sæ-
 cularibus non fuerunt certissimi auctores,
 sub quorum nominibus postea multa pro-
 lata sunt, et ideo repudiata, quia vel his
 quæ ipsorum esse constaret minime con-
 gruerunt, vel eo tempore quo illi scripse-
 rint, nequaquam innotescere, et per ipsos
 vel familiarissimos eorum in posteros pro-
 di commendarique meruerunt.—Hos
 autem libros, quibus illi qui de transverso
 proferuntur comparati respuuntur, unde
 constat esse Hippocratis?—nisi quia
 sic eos ab ipso Hippocratis tempore usque
 ad hoc tempus et deinceps successionis se-
 ries commendavit, ut hinc dubitare de-
 mentis sit? Platonis, Aristotelis, Cicero-
 nis, Varronis, aliorumque ejusmodi auc-
 torum libros, unde noverunt homines,
 quod ipsorum sint, nisi eadem temporum
 sibi succedentium contestatione continua?
 Multi multa de literis ecclesiasticis con-

scripserunt, non quidem auctoritate cano-
 nica, sed aliquo adjuvandi studio, sive dis-
 cendi. Unde constat quid cuius sit, nisi quia
 his temporibus quibus ea quisque scripsit,
 quibus potuit insinuavit atque edidit, et in-
 de in alios atque alios continuata notitia
 latiusque firmata ad posteros, etiam usque
 ad nostra tempora pervenerunt, ita ut in-
 terrogati cuius quisque liber sit, non hæsi-
 temus quid respondere debeamus? Sed
 quid pergam in longe præterita? Ecce
 istas literas quas habemus in manibus, si
 post aliquantum tempus vitæ hujus nos-
 træ, vel illas quisquam Fausti esse, vel has
 neget esse meas, unde convincitur, nisi
 quia illi qui nunc ista noverunt, notitiam
 suam ad longe etiam post futuros continu-
 atis posterorum successionibus trajiciunt?
 Quæ cum ita sint, quis tandem tanto fu-
 rore cæcatur,—qui dicat hoc mereri
 non potuisse Apostolorum ecclesiam, tam
 fidem, tam numerosam fratrum concor-
 diam, ut eorum scripta fideliter ad poste-
 ros trajicerent, cum eorum cathedras us-
 que ad præsentis episcopos certissima suc-
 cessione servaverint; cum hoc qualium-
 cumque hominum scriptis, sive extra ec-
 clesiam, sive in ipsa ecclesia, tanta facili-
 tate proveniat? Contr. Fault. l. 33, cap. 6.

‘the

‘ the writings of divers ecclesiastical authors; forasmuch as they
 ‘ have the testimony of contemporaries, and of those who have
 ‘ lived in succeeding times. I might moreover, by way of il-
 ‘ lustration, produce for examples these now in hand. Suppose
 ‘ some one in time to come should deny those to be the works of
 ‘ Faustus, or these to be mine; how should he be satisfied but
 ‘ by the testimony of those of this time who knew both, and
 ‘ have transmitted their accounts to others? And shall not, then,
 ‘ the testimony of the churches, and Christian brethren, be valid
 ‘ here; especially when they are so numerous, and so harmoni-
 ‘ ous, and the tradition is with so much ease and certainty traced
 ‘ down from the apostles to our time? I say, shall any be so
 ‘ foolish and unreasonable as to deny or dispute the credibility
 ‘ of such a testimony to the scriptures, which would be allowed
 ‘ in behalf of any writings whatever, whether heathen or eccle-
 ‘ siastical?’

So writes Augustine, with respect both to the genuineness and the integrity of the scriptures of the New Testament, in his thirty-third and last book against Faustus.

9. I shall only add one short passage concerning this last particular, the integrity of the text, from another book of the same work.

Augustine, arguing for our Lord’s humanity from these words, Rom. i. 3. *Of the seed of David according to the flesh*, says, ‘ the ^h
 ‘ clause is in all copies ancient and modern. All churches and
 ‘ languages agree with one consent in owning it.’

¹⁰. By all which we perceive how solidly and rationally Augustine defended the authority of the scriptures; and how weak are all the objections which the Manichees brought against the antiquity, genuineness, or purity, of the books of the New Testament.

VIII. Augustine, in the passage of his Summary above cited, said that ‘ the Manichees made use of apocryphal books.’ We shall have full proof of it presently.

But let us first of all examine a charge or two brought against these people.

1. There is a passage in ⁱ Augustine, which might lead some

^h Hoc autem quod adversus impietatem vestram ex apostoli Pauli epistola proferatur, Filium Dei ex semine David esse secundum carnem, omnes codices, et novi et veteres habent, omnes ecclesie legunt, omnes lingue consentiunt. Contr. Faust. l. xi. c. 3.

ⁱ Si enim prolatae fuerint aliquae literae, quae nullo alio narrante ipsius proprie

Christi esse dicantur; unde fieri poterat, ut si vere ipsius essent, non legerentur, non acciperentur, non praecipuo culmine auctoritatis eminent in ejus ecclesia? Quis ergo tam demens, qui hodie credat esse epistolam Christi, quam protulerit Manichaeus, et non credat facta, vel dicta esse Christi, quae scripsit Matthaeus? Aug. Contr. F. l. 28, c. 4.

persons to suspect that the Manichees pretended to have some letter of Christ. Mr. Jones, ^k in his table of apocryphal pieces, not extant, reckons this as one: 'An Epistle of Christ produced by the Manichees.' 'But,' says ^l Beaufobre, 'no ancient author having ever accused them of forging such a letter, and no man having ever seen this pretended letter, it is reasonable to consider what Augustine says only as a supposition, which makes a part of an argument, otherwise also perplexed enough.' Fabricius ^m speaks to the like purpose. Moreover Faustus acknowledgeth that ⁿ Christ did not write the New Testament. If the sect had any letter ascribed to our Saviour, Faustus would have mentioned it: and Augustine in his answer would not only have made a supposition of such a thing, but would have taken particular notice of it.

2. The Manichees are sometimes charged with interpolating, or endeavouring to interpolate and alter the books of the New Testament, in order to render the words of it agreeable to their sentiments.

The passages of Titus above cited imply as much. Pope Leo ^{*} seems to say it expressly.

But they may be acquitted here likewise. I have formerly ^{*} said what is sufficient for answering Titus. And Fabricius ^p has helped us to a good solution for Leo. 'All that is to be understood by his complaint against the Manichees, is, that they made use of some apocryphal books, in which Christ was brought in speaking what he never said: but they did not make any alterations in the words of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John, or any other of the canonical books of the New Testament received by them, but only endeavoured to pervert them by false interpretations.'

^k Jones's Can. of the N. T. Vol. i. p. 145, 146.

^l Hist. Manich. T. i. p. 338, 339.

^m Ex hoc loco non satis firmiter probatur, Manichæos revera Epistolam quamdam singularem sub nomine Christi jactasse. &c. Fabr. Cod. Pl. N. T. T. i. p. 306, not. f.

ⁿ Præsertim quod nec ab ipso scriptum constat. Faust. l. 32, cap. 2.

^o Ipsasque Evangelicas et Apostolicas paginas, quædam auferendo, et quædam inferendo violaverunt: confingentes sibi sub Apostolorum nominibus, et sub verbis ipsis Salvatoris multa volumina falsitatis, quibus erroris sui commenta munirent, et decipiendorum mentibus mortiferum virus effunderent. Leo.

Serm. 4, in Epiph. cap. 4.

^{*} See p. 512.

^p Hæc Leonis verba accipienda sunt de libris apocryphis a nescio quibus futoribus fabularum sub Apostolorum nomine scriptis, quos a Manichæis lectos notat Augustinus, l. 22, c. 79. Contra Faustum, et Timotheus presbyter in loco supra, p. 178, et seq. adducto. In his Salvator subinde loquens inducebatur. Cæterum in Evangeliiis Matthæi, Marci, Lucæ, et Joannis, atque in Epistolis Pauli, nihil vel inferendo vel auferendo violasse hæreticos istos, sed tantum parva interpretatione scripta illa divina pervertisse, testatur Photius MS. contr. Manichæos lib. i. Fabr. ib. p. 306 & 337.

That

That they really did not make any such alterations may be well argued from the testimony given by Photius to the Paulicians of his time, whom he always considers as Manichees. He says, 'they⁹ do not make any material alterations in the scriptures, as Marcion and Valentinus did.' And presently afterwards he says, 'they do not corrupt the gospel by any insertions or additions.'

Mr. Wolff, in his notes upon that passage of Photius, says he does not see how this can be reconciled with the accounts given by Titus and Archelaus. As for Titus, what was formerly said may suffice. Nor is there, perhaps, any greater difficulty in the words of Archelaus. We have indeed seen that^r Mani pretended the scriptures of the New Testament had been altered by others. And in the place referred to by Mr. Wolff, Archelaus says that 'when^s Mani had our scriptures he endeavoured to find in them his doctrine of the two principles: and that when he disputed with him, he strove to support his opinions by the same; censuring some things, and changing others:' that is, I think, perverting them. In a word, Mani perverted some texts of scripture; and some others, that were too hard for him, he censured, as additions, but did not alter the text of the New Testament himself.

Augustine may be reckoned a good witness for them here: 'For,' says^t he, 'if any one should charge you with having interpolated some texts alleged by you, as favourable to your cause, what would you say? Would you not immediately answer that it is impossible for you to do such a thing in books read by all Christians? And that if any such attempt had been made by you, it would have been presently discerned and defeated by comparing the ancient copies? Well then,' says Augustine, 'for the same reason that the scriptures cannot be corrupted by you, neither could they be corrupted by any other people.'

⁹ —τοῖς ρημασι μεν και ονομασιν εδεν μεγα παραλλαττων, εδε κατακωδωλευεν τη λογη το σχημα—και τα μεν ρητα—διδωσι κατεχειν τη τε ευαγγελιου, μητε παρενθηκαις μητε προσθηκαις αιεδη λυμαινομενος. Ph. contr. Manich. l. 1, p. 9, 10.

^r See before, p. 513, 514.

^s Et ut ne multa dicam, comparant universos libros Scripturarum nostrarum, quibus ille acceptis, homo astutus cepit in nostris libris occasiones inquirere dualitatis suae—et in nostris libris, sicut etiam adversus me disputans fecit, assertionem suam proferre, quaedam in his accusans, quaedam permutans.—Arch. cap. 54,

p. 99.

^t Tamen cum ea de iis codicibus proferretis, quos dicitis falsatos, hoc ipsum illic immissum esse diceremus, quod illic de Manichæo sic dictum legeretur, ut de alio intelligere non possemus: quid faceretis, dicite mihi, nisi clamaretis, nullo modo vos potuisse falsare codices, qui jam in manibus essent omnium Christianorum? quia mox ut facere cœpissetis, vetustiorum exemplarium veritate convinceremini. Qua igitur causa a vobis corrumpi non possent, hac causa a nēmine potuerunt. Aug. contr. F. l. 32, c. 16. Vid. et supra. p. 373. not. ^b.

The scriptures therefore were not corrupted; for it was impossible: nor had the Manichees attempted it.

Nor has Augustine, that I remember, any where charged them with such an attempt: though, if there had been reason for it, there were many occasions to mention it. He often speaks of their charge against the catholics. Certainly therefore he would have returned it, if there had been any ground for it.

Moreover, it is evident from Augustine that the Manichees had no copies of the books of the New Testament, different from those used by the catholics: they often said, that the catholic copies were corrupted: but ^u when called upon to produce others, more sincere and uncorrupt, they always declined it.

It is also very remarkable, which Augustine says, that when he was with them, and ^x in their private discourses they insinuated that the scriptures of the New Testament had been corrupted by some men, who were desirous to mix Judaism with Christianity, they produced not any copies different from those commonly received.

Beaufobre has vindicated the Manichees from ^y the charge or suspicion of being the authors of several passages found in some copies of the New Testament. I refer to him: but I do not think it needful for me now to enter into particulars of that kind; I have said what is sufficient to render men easy upon this head.

IX. Augustine, in his Summary, said 'that the Manichees made use of apocryphal books, which they prefer to the canonical scriptures.' That they used such books is unquestionable: but what regard they had for them is not easily perceived by us now.

1. As we are now entering into this inquiry, and are to observe the proofs of the Manichees using apocryphal writings, and what they were, it may not be improper to take notice here of Augustine's definition of such books. 'Apocryphal books,' he ^z says, 'are not such as are of authority [or received by the
VOL. III. M m ' church,]

^u Proferendus est namque tibi alius codex eadem continens, sed tamen incorruptus et verior, ubi sola desint ea quæ hic immixta esse criminariis. Ut si, verbi causa, Pauli epistolam, quæ ad Romanos scripta est, corruptam esse contendis, aliam proferas incorruptam, vel alium codicem potius, in quo ejusdem Apostoli eadem epistola sincera et incorrupta conscripta sit. Non faciam, inquis, ne ipse corrupisse credar, hoc enim soletis dicere. De Mor. Ec. Cath. cap. 29, n. 61.

^x Quam [responsionem] quidem non facile palam promebant, sed nobis secretius, cum dicerent scripturas novi Testamenti falsatas fuisse a nescio quibus, qui Judæorum legem inferere Christianæ fidei voluerunt, atque ipsi incorrupta exemplaria nulla proferrent. Confess. l. 5, c. xi. n. 21. ^y Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 342—344.

^z Aliud est ipsos libros non accipere, et nullo vinculo detineri, quod Pagani de omnibus libris nostris, quod Judæi de
NOVO

‘church,] and are kept secret: but they are books whose original is obscure, and which are destitute of proper testimonials; their authors being unknown, and their character either heretical, or suspected.’ That passage is taken out of Augustine’s answer to Faustus. A like description of such books may be seen^a in his work, entitled *Of the City of God*.

2. Let us now observe some farther proofs of the Manichees using apocryphal scriptures: at the same time we shall perceive, in good measure, what they were.

Photius says of Agapius, a celebrated Manichæan writer, that^b he makes use of the Acts of the twelve apostles, especially those of Andrew.

Philaster says that^c the Manichees, and divers other heretics, make use of apocryphal scriptures. He says particularly, that they have Acts of Andrew, John and Peter.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, having named the three disciples of Mani, Thomas, Buddas, and Herimas, adds: ‘Let^d no man read the gospel according to Thomas: for it is not a work of one of the twelve apostles of Christ, but of one of the three naughty disciples of Mani.’ And in another place he says, ‘The^e Manichees have written a gospel, entitled according to Thomas, by which the minds of the simple are corrupted.’

Faustus speaks as if he had some writings or histories of the apostles Peter, and Andrew, and Thomas, and John, which were not in the catholic canon.

He

novo Testamento faciunt, quod denique nos ipsi de vestris et aliorum hæreticorum, si quos suos et proprios habent, vel de iis qui appellantur apocryphi: non-quod habendi sunt in aliqua auctoritate secreta, sed quia nulla testificationis luce declarati, de nescio quo secreto, nescio quorum præsumptione prolati sunt. Contr. Faust. l. xi. c. 2.

^a Omittamus igitur earum scripturarum fabulas, quæ apocryphæ nuncupantur, eo quod earum occulta origo non claruit patribus, a quibus usque ad nos auctoritas veracium Scripturarum certissima et notissima successione pervenit. In his autem apocryphis etiam invenitur aliqua veritas, tamen propter multa falsa nulla est canonica auctoritas. De Civ. Dei l. 15, c. 23, n. 4.

^b Καὶ ταῖς λεγομέναις δι' πράξεσι τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, καὶ κατὰ ἀνδρῶν, ἢ μοιροῦ συντίθεται, ἀλλὰ κακῶς ἔχει τὸ φρονῆμα τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν. Phot. Cod. 179, p. 405.

^c — e quibus sunt maxime Manichæi, Gnostici, Nicolaitæ, Valentiniani,

et alii quam plurimi, qui apocrypha Prophetarum et Apostolorum, id est Actus separatos habentes, Cānonicas legere Scripturas contemnunt. — Nam Manichæi apocrypha beati Andreæ Apostoli, id est, Actus, quos fecit veniens de Ponto in Græciam, quos conscripserunt tunc discipuli sequentes Apostolum. Unde et habent Manichæi et alii tales Andreæ beati, et Joannis Actus Evāgelistæ beati, et Petri similiter Apostoli; in quibus quia signa fecerunt magna et prodigia, ut pecudes et canes et bestię loquerentur, &c. Philast. Hær. 88.

^d Μὴδεις ἀναγιγνωσκῆτω τὸ κατὰ Θωμᾶν εὐαγγέλιον· ἡ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐνὸς τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, ἀλλ' ἐνὸς τῶν κακῶν τῶν μὴ μαθητῶν. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 31.

^e Ἐγράψαν καὶ μαριχαιοὶ κατὰ Θωμᾶν εὐαγγέλιον, ὅπερ εὐνοῖα τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς παρρησίας ἐπικειχρώμενος, διαφθείρει τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἀπληγῶν. Id. Cat. 4, n. 36.

^f Mitto enim ceteros ejusdem Domini nostri apostolos, Petrum et Andream, Thomam,

He certainly quotes^s The Acts of Paul and Thecla with a good deal of respect, as if he thought it a true history. Of this book I have said something^h already.

Faustus says, 'Theⁱ Virgin Mary was not of the tribe of Judah, but of Levi: forasmuch as her father was a priest, named Joachim.' Augustine, ^k in his answer, calls the book, whence that particular was taken, an apocryphal piece of no authority. Beausobre makes no doubt but^l that it was some book of Leucius.

Augustine often speaks of the Manichees using apocryphal scriptures. In his book against Adimantus he quotes one of those books, containing^m a history of the apostle Thomas. In the same work he relatesⁿ another history of the apostle Peter, taken from their apocryphal scriptures, and probably from the same work where was the forecited history concerning Thomas: and in the twenty-second book of his work against Faustus he relates the^o same account of Thomas from the apocryphal scrip-

M m 2

tures

Thomam, et illum inexpertem Veneris inter ceteros beatum Joannem, qui per diversa professionem [al. possessionem] boni istius inter virgines ac pueros divino praconio cecinerunt, formam nobis atque adeo vobis ipsis faciendarum virginum relinquentes. Sed hos quidem, ut dixi, prætereo; quia eos exclusistis de canone: &c. Faust. l. 30, c. 4.

§ Si vero favere huic quoque proposito et non reluctari volenti, id quoque doctrinam putatis esse demoniorum, taceo nunc vestrum periculum, ipsi jam timeo Apostolo, ne demoniorum doctrinam intulisse Iconium videatur, cum Theclam oppigneratam jam thalamo, in amore sermone suo perpetuæ virginittatis incendit. — Num igitur et de Christo eadem dicere poteritis, aut de apostolo Paulo, quem similiter ubique constat, et verbo semper prætulisse nuptis innuptas, et id opere quoque ostendisse erga sanctissimam Theclam. Quod si hæc demoniorum doctrina non fuit, quam et Theclæ Paulus, et ceteri ceteris annuntiaverunt Apostoli. — Faust. l. 30, c. 4.

^h See the second Part of this work, Vol. ii. p. 286. and p. 311 — 313. and Beauf. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 423.

ⁱ — sed ex tribu Levi, unde sacerdotes: quod ipsum palam est, quia eadem patrem habuit sacerdotem quemdam nomine Joachim, cujus tamen in hac generatione nulla usquam habita mentio est. Faust. l. 23, c. 4.

^k Ac per hoc illud quod de generatione Mariæ Faustus posuit, — quia ca-

nonicum non est, me non constringit. — Hoc ergo potius, vel tale aliquid crederem, si illius apocryphæ scripturæ, ubi Joachim pater Mariæ legitur, auctoritate detinerer. Aug. Contr. Faust. l. 23, n. 9.

^l Cela se trouvoit, sans doute, avec d'autres erreurs, dans le livre de Seleucus, qui avoit écrit l'histoire de la Vierge. Beauf. T. i. p. 354.

^m Ipsi autem legunt scripturas apocryphas, quas etiam incorruptissimas dicunt, ubi scriptum est, apostolum Thomam maledixisse homini, a quo per imprudentiam palma percussus est, ignorante quis esset, maledictumque illud continuo venisse ad effectum. Nam cum ille homo, quoniam minister convivii erat, ut apportaret aquam, exisset ad fontem, a leone occisus et dilaniatus est. — Sic etenim in illa scriptura legitur, quod deprecatus fuerit apostolus pro illo in quem temporaliter vindicatum est, ut ei parceretur in futuro iudicio. Aug. contr. Adim. c. 17, n. 2, T. 8.

ⁿ In illo ergo libro, — legimus ad sententiam Petri cecidisse homines, et mortuos esse virum et uxorem. — Quod isti magna cæcitate vituperant, cum in apocryphis pro magno legant, et illud quod de apostolo Thoma commemoravi, et ipsius Petri filiam paralyticam factam precibus patris, et hortulani filiam ad precem ipsius Petri esse mortuam. ib. c. 17, n. 5.

^o Legunt scripturas apocryphas Manichæi, a nescio quibus futoribus fabularum sub apostolorum nominibus scriptas. —

Ibi

tures used by the Manichees, which, he there says, were composed by some unknown fabulous authors under the names of apostles.

In his answer to an anonymous author, whom he styles an adversary of the law and the prophets, he observes, that ^p author alleged passages out of apocryphal writings under the names of the apostles Andrew and John: which, he says, if they were really theirs, would have been received by the church, which has subsisted with an uninterrupted succession of bishops, from the times of the apostles to our own.

In the disputes with Felix the Manichee, Augustine puts him in mind ^q of a passage of The Acts of Leucius, called Acts of the Apostles, one of the apocryphal scriptures, not received by the catholic church, but much esteemed by the Manichees, as he says.

The same passage is also quoted, as from Leutius or Leucius, by ^r the author De Fide against the Manichees: who also afterwards quotes the ^s same book of Leucius, entitled, Acts of the Apostles, and relates thence a story concerning the apostle Andrew.

3. As we have now had sufficient proofs of the Manichees using apocryphal scriptures, and Leucius has been named, I shall next give some account of this man, who is usually esteemed a great forger of such books.

Ibi tamen legunt apostolum Thomam, cum esset in quodam nuptiarum convivio peregrinus et prorsus incognitus, a quodam ministro palma percussus, imprecatum fuisse homini continuam sævamque vindictam. Nam cum egressus esset ad fontem, unde aquam convivantibus ministraret, cum leo irruens interemit, manumque ejus, qua caput Apostoli levi ictu percusserat, a corpore avulsam, secundum verbum ejusdem Apostoli id optantis atque imprecantis, canis intulit mensis, in quibus ipse discumbebat Apostolus. —

Utrum illa vera sit aut conficta narratio, nihil mea nunc interest. Certe enim Manichæi, a quibus illæ scripturæ, quas canon ecclesiasticus respuit, tamquam veræ ac sinceræ acceptantur, saltem hinc coguntur fateri, &c. Contr. Faust. l. 22, c. 79.

^p Sane de apocryphis iste posuit testimonia, quæ sub nominibus apostolorum Andreæ Joannisque conscripta sunt. Quæ si illorum essent, recepta essent ab ecclesia, quæ ab illorum temporibus per episcoporum successiones certissimas, usque ad nostra et deinceps tempora

perseverat. Contr. Adv. L. et P. l. i. c. 20. in.

^q Habetis etiam hoc in scripturis apocryphis, quas canon quidem catholicus non admittit; vobis autem tanto graviore sunt, quanto a catholico canone secluduntur. Aliquid etiam inde commemorem, cujus ego auctoritate non teneor, sed tu convinceris. In Actibus scriptis a Leutio, quos tamquam Actus Apostolorum scribit, habes ita positum: Etenim speciosa figmenta, &c. Act. cum Fel. l. 2, c. 6.

^r In Actibus etiam conscriptis a Leucio, quos ipsi accipiunt, sic scriptum est; Etenim speciosa figmenta, &c. De Fid. c. 5, ap. Aug. T. 8, in App.

^s Attendite in Actibus Leucii, quos sub nomine Apostolorum scribit, qualia sint quæ accipitis de Maximilla uxore Egetis: — Ibi etiam scriptum est, quod cum eadem Maximilla et Iphidamia simulissent ad audiendum apostolum Andreæ, puerulus quidam speciosus, quem vult Leucius vel Deum, vel certe angelum intelligi, commendaverit eos Andreæ apostolo. De Fid. cap. 38.

In

In the first place I shall take notice of his works, and the ancient authors who have mentioned him; secondly, his opinions; thirdly, his time: after which I intend to add some remarks upon the apocryphal scriptures made use of by the Manichees.

1. I would give some account of the books ascribed to Leucius, and shew the places of ancient authors who have mentioned him: but I must be allowed to be brief. They who are desirous of fuller satisfaction may look into ^t Fabricius, ^u Jones, ^x Beausobre, and others: and possibly I may some time have another opportunity to take farther notice of him.

Leucius is expressly named in ^y two or three passages just cited from Augustine, and the author De Fide: and possibly he is the author of all the other apocryphal pieces before taken notice of from Faustus and Augustine, though he is not there named.

Photius ^z gives an account of a book entitled ^a 'The Travels of the Apostles: in which are contained Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, Paul. The author is Leucius Charinus, as ^a the book itself shews.'

He is mentioned by name in the Decree of ^a Gelafius. All his books are declared to be apocryphal.

He is mentioned in like manner by ^b pope Innocent the first, in one of his epistles.

A large fragment of his Travels of the Apostles is cited ^c in the second council of Nice.

He is mentioned ^d in the supposititious letter of Jerom to Chromatius and Heliodorus, and called Seleucus.

2. In the next place I shall speak a word or two of the opinions of Leucius. The account which Photius gives of them, who had read his work abovementioned, is this: ^e 'He teaches

M m 3

^e that

^t Cod. Apocr. N. T.

Canon of Scripture, vol. i.

de Manich. T. i. p. 348, &c.

cum Fel. l. 2, c. 6. De Fide c. 5, et 38.

^u Ανγιωσθη βιβλιον, αι λεγομεναι των αποστολων περιοδοι: εν αις περιιχοντο πραξεις πეტρου, ιωαννη, ανδρειου, θωμα, παυλου. Γραφει δε αυτας, ως δηλοι το αυτο βιβλιον, λευκιος χαρινος. Phot. Cod. 114, p. 292.

^x Libri omnes, quos fecit Leucius discipulus diaboli, apocryphi. Gelaf. ap. Labb. Conc. T. 4, p. 1264.

^y Cætera autem, quæ vel sub nomine Matthiæ, sive Jacobi minoris, vel sub nomine Petri et Joannis, quæ a quodam Leucio scripta sunt, vel sub nomine Andree, quæ a Henocharide et Leonida philosophis; vel sub nomine Thomæ, et si

^a Of the

^x Hist.

^y Act.

qua sunt alia, non solum repudianda, verum etiam noveris esse damanda. Inn. ad Exup. Ep. 3, ap. Conc. ib. T. 2, p. 1256.

^c εκ των ψευδοπιγραφων περιοδων των αγιων αποστολων. ap. Labb. Conc. T. 7, p. 357, &c. and see Beauf. Hist. de Man. T. i. p. 388, 389, &c.

^d Sed factum est, ut a Manichæi discipulo nomine Seleuco, qui etiam Apostolorum gesta falso sermone conscripsit, hic liber editus, &c. Ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 445.

^e Φησι γαρ αλλοι ειναι τον τω ιουδαϊων θεον και κακον ——— αλλοι δε τον χριστον, ον φησιν αγαθον ——— και καλει αυτον και πατερα και υιον: λεγει δε μηδ' εναιθρωπησαι αληθως, αλλα δοξαι και πολλα πολλακις φανηναι τοις μαθηταις, υιον και πρεσβυτην παλιν, και παλιν παιδα, και μειζονα και ελαττονα,

‘ that the God of the Jews is evil; that the God preached by
 ‘ Jesus Christ is good. He speaks of God by the names of Fa-
 ‘ ther and Son: he says that Christ was not really man, though
 ‘ he appeared to be so; that he appeared to the disciples dif-
 ‘ ferently, sometimes young, sometimes old, and less at one time
 ‘ than another, and sometimes so high as to touch the heavens
 ‘ with his head: he says that Christ was not crucified, but ano-
 ‘ ther in his room; that marriage is evil in itself, and of the evil
 ‘ one; that God is not the creator of dæmons. In the Acts of
 ‘ John he seems to argue against images.’

From this account, though possibly Photius is not exact, and may have misrepresented some things, it may be concluded that ^f Leucius agreed in divers respects with the Manichees, or rather they with him. For we may hence argue that, as he said the God of the Jews was evil, he did not receive the books of the Old Testament. We likewise perceive that he was one of them who are called Docetæ, and that he did not believe Christ to be man really, but in appearance only: he likewise had a disadvantageous opinion of marriage, and highly extolled perpetual virginity: he denied that dæmons were made by God, and condemned the use of pictures and images. Beaufobre ^g has carefully examined the forecited extract of Photius, and made just remarks upon it, for discovering the real sentiments of Leucius.

3. I am to consider the time of Leucius. Mr. Jones was positive that ^h Leucius was a Manichee, and that he did not live before the latter part of the third, or the beginning of the fourth, century after Christ: and many others undoubtedly are of the same opinion. But ⁱ Grabe placeth him in the second century, as does ^k Mill; who supposeth that he flourished about the year of Christ 140, and has a great many just observations upon this man and his works, to whom I refer the reader; not judging it needful to transcribe a modern author who is, or ought to be, in every body’s hands. Beaufobre is exactly of the same mind with the two last mentioned writers: and says that, ^l unless by a Manichee be meant one who held the same or like opinions with them, it is certain that Leucius was not a Manichee, he having

πλαττονα, και μεγαλον, ως τη κορυφην διακειν
 176' οτι μεχρις ηραρε — και τον χριστον
 μη σαυρωθηναι, αλλ' ετερον αυτ' αυτην.
 Γαμος δε ιουδαϊκας αβιται, και πασαν γυναικα
 ποικραν τε και τη ποικρη και πλεον των
 δαιμονων αλλος εκκλησαι — δοκει δε
 κατ' ηκουσαν του ηεροδοτου εις τας ιωαννης
 πραξεις δογματιζειν. Phot Cod. 114, p.
 292.

^f Concerning the opinions
 of Leucius see Beauf. T. i. p. 384—390.

^g ib. p. 384—390.

before, V. i. p. 303, &c.

ⁱ — fig-
 mentum Leucii hæretici, seculo secundo
 plura ejusmodi eudentis, Grabe Spic. T.
 i. p. 58.

Leucius, five Lucius,
 Marcionis successor. Sec. ii. ib. p. 78.
 — quæ Lucium seculi ii. hæreticum
 auctorem habere videntur. ib. p. 324.

^k Proleg. n. 333—340.

de Man. T. i. p. 349, 350.

^h as

fig-

mentum

Leucii

hæretici,

seculo

secundo

plura

ejusmodi

eudentis,

Grabe

Spic. T.

i. p. 58.

Leucius,

five

Lucius,

Marcionis

successor.

Sec. ii.

ib. p. 78.

— quæ

Lucium

seculi ii.

hæreticum

auctorem

habere

videntur.

ib. p. 324.

^k Proleg.

n. 333—340.

de Man.

T. i. p. 349, 350.

^l Hist.

lived

lived more than a hundred years before Mani was born. He then proceeds to mention ^m divers arguments for that supposition, which appears to me very considerable: but I may not now stay to transcribe or abridge them.

4. Lastly, I am to mention some observations upon the works of Leucius, and the apocryphal writings made use of by the Manichees.

1. It seems to me not improbable that all the preceding quotations of apocryphal books in Augustine are taken out of one and the same book, called Acts or Travels of the Apostles, and composed by Leucius.

2. So much I said formerly. I now add: It seems to me that the Apocryphal Acts of Andrew, Thomas, Peter, John, and even Paul, were not distinct books, but parts of one and the same work called Acts of the Apostles. Photius, as before quoted, calls the work of Leucius, Travels of the Apostles. That very title might lead us to suppose there was somewhat in that piece concerning all, or most of the apostles. In his article of Agapius he says, 'that Manichæan author makes use of The Acts of the twelve Apostles, especially those of Andrew.' It does not follow that The Acts of Andrew or Thomas, or the like, were distinct works because they are sometimes quoted severally and alone. We have a proof of this in the article of Leucius, just now transcribed from Photius, where at the end he mentions The Acts of John distinctly: whilst yet, unquestionably, they were a part only of the work before described by the general title of The Travels of the Apostles: which also he expressly said contained The Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, Paul. Mill likewise ⁿ allows it to be one work which contained Acts of several apostles.

3. Another observation to be mentioned here is, that there is no good reason to think, as some have done, that the apocryphal scriptures, made use of by the Manichees, were forged by them. No, they had no occasion to forge books of that sort: for they found most of their sentiments encouraged by apocryphal books, composed by authors of earlier antiquity. Those ^o books favoured their sentiments concerning the seeming humanity of Jesus, the merit of virginity or celibacy, and the imperfection of the marriage-state. They therefore took the advantage of those writings, and sometimes quoted or appealed to them.

^m ib. p. 350, 351. ⁿ Confarci- lumen 1. Acta Petri. — 2. Acta
nati quoque erant ab eodem Charino, Joannis. — 3. Acta Andreæ. —
teste, qui librum ipsum diligenter perus- 4. Acta Thomæ. — Mill. Proleg.
trarat, Photio, *Ἱστορίας Apostolorum*. n. 337, 338. ^o Beauf. T. i. p. 424.
— Complectebatur autem istud vo-

Cyril, above quoted, says the gospel of Thomas was written by a disciple of Mani, so called. But ^p Beaufobre well argues that this gospel was not forged by the Manichees; forasmuch as it was in being before the rise of Manichæism; and is mentioned among spurious writings, not only by ^q Eusebius, but also by ^r Origen, in the preface to his Commentary upon St. Luke's Gospel. He adds, that the gospel of Thomas is placed among apocryphal books in the Synopsis, which is in ^s the works of Athanasius, without imputing it to the Manichees. Gelasius likewise contents himself with saying of this gospel, that ^t it was used by the Manichees, without adding that it was forged by them.

The same may be shewn to be probable with regard to other books made use of by the Manichees.

Eusebius, among spurious books written by heretics, reckons ^u Acts of Andrew, John, and other apostles. Epiphanius says that ^x The Acts of Andrew, John, and Thomas, were used by the Encratites: The ^y Acts of Andrew and Thomas by the apostolics: The ^z Acts of Andrew and other apostles by the Origenists: all three sects, which are supposed to be older than the ^a Manichees.

Augustine particularly observes of ^b a hymn used by the Priscillianists, that it was among the apocryphal scriptures: and then adds, 'Not that these apocryphal scriptures are peculiarly theirs; for there are several sects of very different opinions from each other, who delight in those books, as fetching thence some support for some of their notions.'

4. I add but one observation more, which is, that these apocryphal books confirm the history of the genuine and authentic scriptures of the New Testament. They do not directly contradict them; they indirectly confirm and establish them. For they are composed and written in the names of such as our authentic scriptures say were apostles, or companions of apostles. They all suppose the dignity of our Lord's person, and the power of working miracles, together with a high degree of authority, to have been conveyed by him to his apostles.

^p ib. p. 345.

^c 25, p. 97. D.

Origen, with remarks upon it may be seen in the second Vol. of this work, p. 501, &c.

^s Athan. T. 2, p. 202.

^t Evangelium nomine Thomæ, quo utuntur Manichæi, apocryphus. Gelas. ap. Labb. Conc. T. 4, p. 1264.

^u H. E. l. 3, c. 25, p. 97. D.

^x Epiph. H. 47, n. 2.

^y H. 61, n. 1.

^z H. 63, n. 2.

^a See before ch. xli. p. 20, &c.

^b Hymnus sane, quem dicunt esse Do-

^q Hist. Ec. l. 3,

^r The passage of

Origen, with remarks upon it may be seen in the second Vol. of this work, p. 501, &c.

^s Athan. T. 2, p. 202.

^t Evangelium nomine Thomæ, quo utuntur Manichæi, apocryphus. Gelas. ap. Labb. Conc. T. 4, p. 1264.

^u H. E. l. 3, c. 25, p. 97. D.

^x Epiph. H. 47, n. 2.

^y H. 61, n. 1.

^z H. 63, n. 2.

^a See before ch. xli. p. 20, &c.

^b Hymnus sane, quem dicunt esse Do-

mini nostri Jesu Christi, ——— in scripturis solet apocryphis inveniri. Quæ non proprie Priscillianistarum sunt, sed alii quoque hæretici eis nonnullarum sectarum impietate vanitatis utuntur, inter se quidem diversa sentientes, unde suas quisque varias hæreses sunt secuti. Sed scripturas istas habent in sua diversitate communes, easque illi præcipue frequentare assolent, qui legem veterem et prophetas canonicos non accipiunt. Ep. 237, al. 253, n. 2.

S E C T. VII.

Various readings, and select passages, in Faustus the Manichee.

I SHALL here take some notice of various readings in the New Testament, or the texts of scripture made use of by the Manichees, and likewise some select passages, or observations, in Faustus the Manichee.

1. The catholics, as ^a Faustus observes, asserted the integrity of the books of the New Testament, and could not endure the supposition that they had been corrupted and interpolated.

2. Faustus says that ^b the gospel of Jesus Christ is nothing but the preaching, or the doctrine and commandments, of Christ. Beaufobre assents ^c to this explication as right, and prefers it to Augustine's: though that great writer did not forget to allege ^d 2 Tim. ii. 8.

3. We evidently perceive, from the work of Faustus, that ^e both the catholic and the Manichæan copies of the New Testament had the two genealogies in St. Matthew and St. Luke.

4. It looks as if ^f Faustus understood the beatitude, Matt. v. 3, of worldly poverty, and the mourning in ver. 4, of afflictions in this life; and ver. 6, of bodily hunger and thirst for the sake of righteousness: though, as it seems, this last mentioned text,

^a Sed quia vobis ita placet, qui nunquam sine stomacho auditis aliquid esse in Apostolo cauponatum, ne hoc quidem nobis sciatis esse contrarium. Faust. l. xi. c. 1.

^b — et interrogas, utrum accipiam Evangelium? nisi adhuc nescis, quid sit quod Evangelium nuncupatur. Est enim nihil aliud, quam prædicatione et mandatum Christi. Faust. l. 5, c. 1. Vides in me Christi beatitudines illas, quæ Evangelium faciunt, et interrogas, utrum accipiam? ibid. — Quia evangelium quidem a prædicatione Christi et esse cepit et nominari. — Id. l. 2, c. 1. Scias me, ut dixi, accipere Evangelium, id est, prædicationem Christi. ib.

^c Cependant je dois rendre justice à Fauste. Il n'explique pas mal, et si j'en ose dire, il explique mieux que S. Augustin, ce que veut dire le mot d'Évangile. Il entend par là, non l'histoire de la naissance, et des actions de J. Christ, mais le doctrine, que Jésus Christ a prêchée. — Et quoique S. Augustin eût raison dans le fond, il n'en avoit pas néanmoins de sou-

tenir, comme il faisoit, que l'histoire de la naissance de J. Christ est comprise dans l'idée de ces mots, *Évangile de J. Christ*, qui ne signifioit autre chose, que la doctrine prêchée par Jésus Christ. Beauf. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 298, 299.

^d — hanc scilicet causam subjiciens, quia generatio Christi non pertinet ad Evangelium. Quid ergo respondebis Apostolo dicenti, Memor esto Christum Jesum resurrexisse a mortuis, ex semine David secundum Evangelium meum? Aug. contr. Faust. l. 2, c. 2. ^e Quid enim scripsit? Liber generationis Jesu Christi filii David, &c. Faust. l. 2, c. 1. Sed offensus duorum maxime Evangelistarum dissensione, qui genealogiam ejus scribunt, Lucæ et Matthæi, hæsi. &c. l. 3, c. 1. Vid. et l. 7, c. 1, et l. 23, c. 1, 2.

^f Vides pauperem, vides mitem, — lugentem, esurientem, sitientem, persecutiones et odia sustinentem propter justitiam. l. 5, c. 1. — beati qui lugent, beati qui esuriunt, beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter justitiam. ib. c. 3.

which

538 *Credibility of the Gospel History.* Part II. Ch. LXIII. vol. 6. p. 407.
which we render *hunger and thirst after righteousness*, was read ^s as it is now in our present copies.

5. Faustus had Matt. xxviii. 19, in his ^h copies.

6. He likewise quotes ⁱ the beginning of St. Mark's and St. John's gospels.

7. There is some reason to think that Faustus read Luke xxiii. 43, as ^k Origen did: 'This ^l day shalt thou be with me in 'the paradise of God,' or 'of my Father.'

8. Faustus ^m has the history of the woman taken in adultery, which is at the beginning of the eighth chapter of St. John's gospel.

9. Mani, in The Dispute with Archelaus, understands our Lord to say ⁿ in John viii. 44, that 'the devil is a liar, as is also 'his father.' Upon this text the curious may consult ^o Mill, and ^p Beaufobre.

10. Augustine, in his work against Faustus, says, that in some Latin ^q copies they had, Rom. i. 3, 'Which was *born* of the seed 'of David;' instead of *made*, which is in the Greek.

11. Faustus ^r and ^s Secundinus quote St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians by that title.

12. I put in the margin the definitions which ^t Faustus gives of schism and heresy.

^z — quomodo esurientem et sitientem justitiam, quam Faustus in scriptis suis non addidit. Aug. Contr. Faust. l. 5, c. 7.

^b Et alibi ad discipulos: Ite, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, — F. l. 5, c. 3.

^d At denique Marcus, — vide quam sit competenter exorsus: Evangelium, inquit, Jesu Christi, Filii Dei. Faust. l. 2, c. i. Sed Joannes quidem in principio fuisse Verbum dicit, et Verbum fuisse apud Deum, et Deum fuisse Verbum. Marcus vero, Evangelium, inquit, Jesu Christi, Filii Dei. l. 3, c. 1. Cur ergo credunt Joanni dicenti, In principio erat Verbum? Aug. C. Faust. l. 7, c. 2.

^k See before V. ii. p. 528.

^l — Cum latronem Christus de ligno secum introduxerit in paradisum Patris sui. Faust. l. 14, c. 1. — et ipso eodem die secum futurum dixit eum in paradiso Patris sui. Id. l. 33, c. 1.

^m In injustitia namque et in adulterio deprehensam mulierem quamdam Judæis arcuantibus absolvit, ipse præcipiens ei ut

jam peccare desineret. Faust. l. 33, c. 1.

ⁿ — cum loquitur mendacium, de suis propriis loquitur; quoniam mendax est, sicut et pater ejus. ap. Arch. c. 29, p. 48. Conf. c. 33, p. 56, et c. 13, p. 24, f.

^o Ad Joh. viii. 44, et Proleg. 793.

^p Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 105, 388. T. 2, p. 263.

^q Et si enim in quibusdam Latinis exemplaribus non legitur *factus*, sed, *natus ex semine David*, cum Græca factus habeant, &c. Contr. Faust. l. xi. c. 4.

^r Dicit ad Ephesios. Faust. l. 24, c. 1.

^s Contra quos se Apostolus in Ephesiorum epistola certamen subuisse fatetur. Secundin. ad Aug. c. 1.

^t Schisma, nisi fallor, est eodem opinantem atque eodem ritu colentem quo cæteri, solo congregationis delectari discidio. Secta vero est longe alia opinantem quam cæteri, alio etiam sibi ac longe dissimili ritu divinitatis instituisse culturam. Faust. l. 20, c. 3. Porro autem sectas si quæras, non plus erunt quam duæ, id est, Gentium et nostra, qui eis longe diversa sentimus. ib. c. 4, in fin.

SECT. VIII. The conclusion of the history of the Manichees.

IN composing this chapter I have made much use of Beausobre's History of Manichee and Manichæism; and I have often quoted him as I have gone along. Nevertheless it was fit to make this renewed and final acknowledgment of my obligations. Sometimes, however, I have differed from him; whether with reason or not, others have a right to judge. That work of Beausobre contains not only a laboured history of the Manichees, but likewise several entertaining and useful digressions concerning the opinions of the heathen philosophers, and the most early Christian sects. I wish some learned man might have sufficient leisure and encouragement to give us a handsome edition of it in (G) English.

It may be thought by some that, in writing the history of this people, I have taken a great deal of liberty with the ancient writers of the Christian church. Nevertheless, I know that I have not designed to disparage them: and I humbly hope that I have not lessened their just credit and authority. No men are infallible. In controversial writings, especially where the difference of opinion is very great, it is difficult for the best of men to keep themselves entirely free from the influence of prejudice and passion. Moreover, Manichæism is in itself an abstruse and intricate subject; and had it's rise in Persia, a country remote from most of those ecclesiastical writers who have come down to us; which makes a good apology for them, though they should be supposed to have made some mistakes, and to have been guilty of some misrepresentations. It is acknowledged by such as have looked into this matter, ^a that the history of Mani and his followers has long lain in great obscurity and uncertainty. This may be allowed to be a good reason why I should take some

(G) What is to be expected of Beausobre, may be concluded from what he says of himself, when he enters upon the examination of the scandalous story of the Manichæan eucharist: 'As for me,' says he, 'whom heaven has preserved from the spirit of the church, who know no greater good than freedom of thought, nor any more delightful employment than the search of truth, nor greater pleasure than that of finding and speaking it, I have studied ecclesiastical history with as little prejudice as possible.' Pour moi, que le ciel a préservé de l'esprit de l'église, qui ne

connois point de plus grand bien que la liberté de penser, de plus douce occupation que la recherche de la vérité, ni de plus grand plaisir que celui de la trouver et de la dire, &c. Hist. de Manichée et du Manichéisme. T. 2, p. 730.

^a Hæc nos compendio, et pro more nostro, de Manete, ejusque scriptis. Cum vero Manetis historiam mire turbaverint tum veterum, tum recentiorum plures, neque ea adhuc satis dilucide exposita sit, non abs re erit illam paullo accuratius et explicatius enarrare. Cav. H. L. in Manete. T. i. p. 140. Oxon.

more than ordinary pains about it, and endeavour to avoid and correct the errors which others seem to have fallen into.

It may be easily supposed that for several reasons I could wish this history had been shorter. However I presume it will be found upon trial that the length of it is not altogether unprofitable. And I persuade myself it will afford my readers divers useful and agreeable reflections. I propose to mention some, not doubting but that others of taste and judgment will think of more.

1. The rise of Manichæism in Persia is a proof of the early planting the gospel in that country. If Christianity had not been there before, Mani could not have formed a new sect of Christians. 'Heresies and schisms,' as ^b Augustine says, 'break the gospel-nets. Some in one place, some in another: the Donatists in Africa, the Arians in Egypt,—the Manichees in Persia.' According to Abulpharagius, Mani ^c was at first a Christian priest, and he preached and explained the scriptures, and disputed against the Jews, the Magi, and the heathens. Beausobre ^d has an article on purpose concerning the planting the gospel in Persia.

2. We cannot avoid recollecting, in the next place, the just observation of Socrates, taken notice of by us at our entrance into this field: 'It is no unusual thing for cockle to grow up amongst good grain.' It is no other than what our Lord foresaw, and likewise forewarned the disciples of, that they might not be too much surprised at the event. *The kingdom of heaven, he said, is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept his enemy came, and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way.*—Matt. xiii. 24,—30. Again: *The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind:* ver. 47. *Then said he unto the disciples, It is impossible but offences will come; but woe unto him by whom they come:* Luke xvii. 1. And St. Paul says to the Corinthians: *There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you:* 1 Cor. xi. 19. Indeed, before the apostles left this world they saw divers corruptions getting into the churches, or actually brought into them.

^b Disruptis retibus, hereses et schismata facta sunt. Retia quidem omnes concludunt. Sed impatientes pisces, — ubi possunt, impingunt se, et rumpunt, et exeunt. — Et retia quidem illa per totum expanduntur. Qui rumpunt autem, per loca rumpunt. Donatistæ ruperunt in Africa, Ariani ruperunt in Ægypto, Photiniani ruperunt in Pannonia, Cataphry-

ges ruperunt in Phrygia, Manichæi ruperunt in Perside. Aug. Sermon. 252, n. 4. T. v. al. in Dieb. Pasch. Sermon. 23.

^c Hic primo Christianismus præse tulit, et sacerdos factus est Ehwazi, docuitque et interpretatus est libros, [sacros,] et cum Judæis, Magis, et Ethnicis disputavit. Gregor. Abulph. Dynast. p. 82.

^d T. i. p. 180—196.

3. There

3. There were early two very different opinions concerning Christ. 'Some,' as ^e Augustine observes, 'believed Christ to be God, and denied him to be man. Others believed he was a man, and denied him to be God.' Of this opinion ^f was Augustine for a while, at his first getting out of Manichæism, as he says, till ^g he became acquainted with some Platonic writings. And it has been thought by some that this last was likewise the notion which (H) the Jews of old had of their expected Messiah. Therefore Athanasius says that 'the ^h apostles of Christ, well knowing the Jewish prejudices upon this head, with great wisdom first instructed them in our Saviour's humanity.' The former was the opinion of the Manichees, and of many others

^e Sic enim quidam Deum credendo Christum, et hominem egando erraverunt. Et rursus quidam hominem putando, et Deum negando, aut contemnerunt, aut in homine spem suam ponentes, in illud maledictum inciderunt. Contr. Faust. l. 13, c. 8. Ait enim, Christus Deus est tantum, omnino hominis nihil habens. Hoc Manichæi dicunt. Photiniani, homo tantum; Manichæi, Deus tantum. Illi nihil divinum in Domino confitentur; isti quasi totum divinum. — Serm. 37, c. 12.

^f Ego vero aliud putabam, tantumque sentiebam de Domino Christo meo, quantum de excellentis sapientiæ viro, cui nullus posset æquari: præsertim quia mirabiliter natus ex virgine, ad exemplum contemnendorum temporalium pro adipiscenda immortalitate, divina pro nobis cura tantam auctoritatem magisterii meruisse videbatur. Quid autem sacramenti haberet, Verbum caro factum est, ne suspicari quidem poteram. Confess. l. 7, c. 19, n. 25. ^g Et primo volens ostendere mihi, — quod Verbum tuum caro factum est, et habitavit inter homines, procurasti mihi per quemdam hominem — Platoniorum libros ex Græca lingua in Latinam versos. Et ibi legi, non quidem his verbis, sed hoc idem omnino multis et multiplicibus suaderi rationibus, quod in principio erat Verbum, &c. Confess. l. 7, c. 9, n. 13, et 14. Vid. ib. l. 8, c. 2, n. 3.

(H) Beausobre's account of that matter is to this purpose: 'At the beginning of Christianity, there arose two opposite errors concerning the person of our Saviour. The first obtained among the Christians that came out of Judaism. Many persuaded themselves that the Christ was but a mere man, distinguished from others by the abundance of divine gifts conferred upon him, and by his incom-

parable virtues. "In the time of the apostles," says Athanasius, "the Jews were in this error, and drew the Gentiles into it: that the Christ is only a mere man, that he is not God, and that the Word was not made flesh." De Sent. Dionys. p. m. 432. These Jews were not the unbelieving Jews, but such as made profession of Christianity. But though they agreed so far, they were not all of the same mind concerning the nativity of our Saviour. Some believed that he was the Son of Joseph and Mary. — Others acknowledged that he was born of a virgin, and conceived by the sole operation of the Holy Spirit. Neither the one nor the other refused him the title of the Son of God: but they imagined that it was given him on account of the eminence of his office, the excellence of his gifts, his glorious resurrection, the sovereign authority and dominion to which he was advanced by the Father: to all which, these last added his miraculous nativity. These kept the name of Nazarenes which had been given to the first believers. The others were called Ebionites. These two are the most ancient heresies of Christianity. Antiquissima hæresis ista fuit, et ab ipso religionis Christianæ exordio grassari cœpit. Petav. Dogm. Th. T. v. De Incarn. l. 1, 2, § 3. In a short time arose another quite opposite, but not less pernicious than the former.' Hist. Manich. T. 2, p. 517.

^h Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οἱ τότε Ἰουδαῖοι — νομίζοντες τοὺς Χριστοὺς φίλους ἀνθρώπων μόνον, ἐκ σπέρματος δακίδι ἐρχισθαι — τότε ἵνα καὶ πολλὰς τῆς συνεισῶς οἱ μακάριοι ἀποστολὰς τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τῇ σαρκὶ πρῶτον ἐξηγείντο τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. Athan. de Sent. Dion. T. i. p. 248, C.

before

before them. Jerom says, that ' whilst ⁱ the apostles were still ' living, and when the blood of Christ was scarce cold in Judea, ' there were men who taught that his body was no more than ' a phantom.' This opinion is more than once censured by ^k Ignatius in his epistles, written soon after the beginning of the second century; which, as ^l Cotelerius observes, plainly shews the early rise of this false doctrine.

4. We may now discern the true character of the Manichees. I formerly said they were rather a sect of reasoners and philosophers than enthusiasts. But they were very indifferent critics; otherwise they would not have treated the New Testament as they did; nor have pretended that those books were falsely inscribed, and greatly interpolated, which had such evidences of genuineness and integrity. Faustus, so celebrated a teacher among them, does not appear to have been a man of much reading. He had a plausible way of speaking, and an agreeable manner of setting off his opinions; and that is all. Though the Manichees made high pretensions to ^m truth, reason, science, they did not escape superstition. With all their boastings of that kind, and the contempt they expressed for the credulity of the catholics and their numerous rites, there was not a sect that rendered themselves more miserable by affected austerities than the Manichees. The restraints laid on all the higher order, the elect, with regard to marriage, diet, and secular business, must, I think, have more than equalled all the superstitious usages of the catholics at that time. And when it is considered what ⁿ difficulty the Manichæan auditors must have had to maintain their elect, and with how little hopes of getting to heaven at last; I mean directly, without the fatigue of I know not how many transmigrations, as it might happen; this people must appear ridiculous and contemptible.

5. The subsistence of the Christian religion to our time, notwithstanding the many dangers it has been exposed to, affords us reason to hope it shall maintain itself, and be upheld to the

ⁱ Apostolis adhuc in seculo superstibus, adhuc apud Judæam Christi sanguine recenti, phantasma Domini corpus asserbatur. Hier. adv. Lucif. T. 4, p. 304, in.

^k Εἰ δὲ ὡς περ τινες αἱρεῖς οὗτοι, τῶν ἐν ἀποστόλοις, λεγόντων, τὸ δοκεῖν ἀποθανεῖν αὐτοῦ, κ. λ. Ign. ad Trall. c. x. et passim.

^l Solem negaret meridie lucere, qui Docetas seu phantasiastas hæreticos temporibus apostolorum inficiaretur erupisse. Co-tel. ad. Ign. Ep. ad. Trall. c. x.

^m Incidi in homines superbe delirantes. —Et dicebant. Veritas, et veritas. Et

multum eam dicebant mihi. Aug. Conf. l. 3, cap. 6, sub in. —ut a vobis, magnis omnino pollicitatoribus rationis atque veritatis, quæram. —De M. Manich. c. 17, n. 55. ⁿ Quid autem fallitis Auditores vestros, qui cum suis uxoribus, et filiis, et familiis, et domibus, et agris vobis serviunt, —eis non resurrectionem, sed revolutionem ad istam mortalitatem promittitis, ut rursus nascantur, —Contr. Faust. l. 5, cap. x. Vid. supra. p. 476, not. ^s.

end of time, whatever oppositions may be yet made against it. It cannot encounter worse enemies than it has already experienced and withstood: nor can there arise more absurd, or more different opinions in the church, and among Christians, than there were in former times. Some there have been who have handed down to us, in the main, the genuine principles of the Christian religion. And by the events of past ages we are encouraged to trust in Providence, and do our best to serve the cause and interests of truth and liberty.

6. It is not unlikely that differences of opinion, and the disputes they occasion, are some way of use for advancing the interest of truth. The great Augustine was plainly of this opinion. He says that ° objections against scripture, and false interpretations, excite our zeal and industry, and induce to study, until we have learned the right sense. Augustine has upon several occasions spoken ¶ of the advantage which the catholic interest receives from heresies.

7. The Manichees have not weakened but confirmed the evidence of the Christian religion. They agree with other Christians in acknowledging the dignity of Christ's person, his high authority, and the authority of his apostles, and other things which were formerly insisted on by us, and need not to be repeated here. And they received all, or well nigh all, the same books of the New Testament which were received by other Christians. They said, indeed, that those scriptures had been interpolated in some time past: but they never corrupted or interpolated them, nor attempted it. Nor could they, or any others, corrupt them

° Sed ideo divina providentia multos diversi erroris hæreticos esse permittit, ut cum insultant nobis, et interrogant nos ea quæ nescimus, vel sic excutiamus pigritiam, et divinas scripturas nosse cupiamus. Propterea et Apostolus dicit: Oportet hæreses esse, ut probati manifesti fiant inter vos. Illi enim Deo probati sunt, qui bene possunt docere. Sed manifesti hominibus esse non possunt, nisi eum docent: docere autem nolunt, nisi eos qui doceri quærent. Sed multi ad quærendum pigri sunt, nisi per molestias et insultationes hæreticorum quasi de somno excitentur, et de illa imperitia sua periclitari se sentiant. Qui omnes, si bonæ sint fidei, non cedunt hæreticis, sed quid eis respondeant diligentius inquirunt. Nec eos deserit Deus, ut petentes accipiant, et quærentes inveniant, et pulsantibus aperiatur. Aug. de Genesi contr. Manich. l. i. c. i. n. 2. Didici-

mus enim, singulas quasque hæreses intulisse ecclesiæ proprias quæstiones, contra quas diligentius defenderetur scriptura divina, quam si nulla necessitas cogeret. Id. de Dono Persever. c. 20, n. 23. Tom. 10.

¶ Utitur enim [Ecclesia Catholica] gentibus ad materiam operationis suæ, hæreticis ad probationem doctrinæ suæ. De Vera Relig. cap. 6, n. 10. Tom. i. Sed quoniam verissime dictum est, oportet multas hæreses esse, — utamur etiam isto divinæ providentiæ beneficio. Ex his enim hominibus hæretici fiunt, qui etiam si essent in ecclesia, nihilominus errarent. Cum autem foris sunt, plurimum profunt, non verum docendo, quod nesciunt, sed ad verum quærendum carnales, et ad verum aperiendum spiritales Catholicos excitando. — Quapropter multi, ut diem Dei videant et gaudeant, per hæreticos de somno excitantur. ib. cap. 8, n. 18.

if they would, as ¹ Augustine observes. And the controversy with them has occasioned the writing of many books, containing numerous quotations of the scriptures, and excellent vindications of their genuineness and integrity.

8. We are very much indebted to Augustine, and many other learned Christians of former times, who asserted and maintained the authority of the Old, and the genuineness and integrity of the New, Testament; and gave a better account of the creation of the world, of ² human liberty, and ³ the nature and origin of evil, than was taught by these people.

9. We may hence learn to exercise moderation toward men of different sentiments, and to keep our temper in disputing with them. In all probability we shall never meet with any men, Christians at least, who differ more from us than the Manichees did from the catholics. Those unreasonable men rejected all the scriptures of the Old Testament in the lump. They asserted that the books of the New Testament had been long ago interpolated, and that they were not all written by those whose names they bear. They held two eternal principles, and denied the humanity of Christ and the resurrection of the body. And yet Augustine professeth much mildness and moderation toward them. And, entering into an argument with them, he offers to God a fervent prayer that ⁴ he may be enabled to govern his passions, and seek their conversion, not their destruction. Possibly he did not always fully observe the rules, which in the time of sedate judgment he prescribed to himself as just and reasonable. But the passage, which I chiefly refer to, is so beautiful and empha-

¹ Qua igitur causa a vobis corrumpi non possent, hac de causa a nemine poterunt. Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 16.

² Ἐστὶ μὲν ἢ ἡ κακία ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ἀνυπόστατος· πρᾶξις πολλοῦ ἢ ὅσα ἡσά, καὶ πρᾶξις ἐκ προαιρέσεως συνέβαινα. κ. λ. Serap. contr. Manich. p. 44, fin.

³ Peccatorum originem non libero arbitrio voluntatis, sed substantiæ tribuunt gentis adversæ: quam dogmatizantes esse hominibus mixtam, omnem carnem non Dei, sed malæ mentis perhibent esse opificium, quæ a contrario principio Deo coæterna est. &c. De Hær. cap. 46, sub fin.

Quam concupiscentiam, quod sæpe inculcandum est, non vitium substantiæ bonæ, sed malam vult esse substantiam. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 106.

Vos autem asseritis quamdam naturam atque substantiam malum esse. De M. Manich. cap. 2, n. 2.

Veritas autem dicit, omnia ista quæ videmus, et quæ non videmus, quæ naturaliter subsistunt, a Deo facta esse: in quibus rationalem creaturam, etiam ipsam factam, sive in angelis sive in hominibus, accepisse liberum arbitrium: quo libero arbitrio si Deo servire vellet, secundum voluntatem ac legem Dei, haberet apud eum æternam felicitatem.——Ecce autem liberum arbitrium, atque inde peccare quemque si velit, non peccare si nolit, &c. Aug. ap. Act. cum Felic. l. 2, c. 3.

⁴ Unum verum Deum omnipotentem—et rogavi, et rogo, ut in refellenda et revincenda hæresi vestra, Manichæi, cui et vos fortasse imprudentius quam malitiosius adhæsitis, det mihi mentem pacatam atque tranquillam, et magis de vestra correctione, quam de subversione cogitantem. Contr. Ep. Fund. cap. i. in.

tical,

tical, that I have transcribed it largely at the bottom of the * page. And I would translate it too, but that I am not able to reach the energy of his expressions. In the general he says: 'Let them be severe against you, who know not with what labour truth is discovered, and how difficultly error is avoided. 'Let them be severe against you, who know not how hardly the diseases of the mind are cured, and the eye of the understanding strengthened to bear the light. Let them be severe against you, who are insensible how little we can know of God after our best endeavours to understand his perfections. 'Let them treat you with rigour, who never were entangled in a like error. 'As for me, I can by no means treat you in that manner; but must exercise toward you that patience and long-suffering which I once wanted, and which my friends shewed me, when with a blind and furious zeal I not only maintained, but propagated to the utmost of my power, the principle in which you are still engaged.'

It will be one good use of all this long history, if we learn to form charitable sentiments of other men, and to practise moderation toward them; no longer debating with those who differ from us, as if we were infallible, but as inquirers after truth, even as we desire they should do: which is also particularly recommended by the same renowned writer.

SECT. IX. The PAULICIANS.

I. *Their history.* II. *Their testimony to the scriptures.*

I. I TAKE this opportunity to give a brief account of the Paulicians, who were mentioned ^a before, and are usually reck-

* Illi in vos sciant, qui nesciunt cum quo labore verum inveniat, et quam difficile caveantur errores. Illi in vos sciant, qui nesciunt quam rarum et arduum sit carnalia phantasmata piæ mentis serenitate superare. Illi in vos sciant, qui nesciunt cum quanta difficultate sanetur oculus interioris hominis. — Illi in vos sciant, qui nesciunt quibus suspiriis et gemitibus fiat, ut ex quantalacunque parte possit intelligi Deus. Postremo in vos sciant, qui nunquam tali errore decepti sunt, quali vos deceptos vident. Ego autem, qui diu multumque jactatus, tandem respicere potui, — qui denique illa signa, quæ vos diuturna consuetudine implicatos et constrictos tenent, et quasi

curiose, et adtente audi, et temere credidi, et instanter quibus potui persuasi, — scire in vos non possum, quos sicut me ipsum illo tempore, ita nunc debeo sustinere, et tanta patientia vobiscum agere, quanta mecum egere proximi mei, cum in vestro dogmate rabiosus et cæcus errarem. ibid. cap. 2. n. 2, 3. — illud quod vis judice impetrare me a vobis oportet, ut in utraque parte omnis arrogantia deponatur. Nemo nostrum dicat, se jam invenisse veritatem. Sic eam quæramus, quasi ab utrisque nesciatur. Ita enim diligenter et concorditer quæri poterit, si nulla temeraria præsumptione inventa est cognita esse credatur. Id. ib. n. 4.

^a See p. 407.

oned a branch of the Manichees. But Beausobre says that^b though they are sometimes confounded with the Manichees, they agreed but little with them. And indeed Peter of Sicily intimates that^c they did not own themselves to be Manichees.

They are generally supposed to have first appeared in the seventh century, in the country of Armenia, and to have been so called from^d Paul, son of Callinice, a Manichæan woman, who had another son named John, who also was a zealous preacher of this doctrine, called revived Manichæism.

Photius says they^e hold two principles, as the Manichees do; he^f calls Mani their master: he continually considers their sect as a^g branch of Manichæism.

I formerly^h mentioned a particularity of theirs. Photius likewise says thatⁱ they did not chuse to have their ministers called priests, but scribes or secretaries, or *companions in travel*, the word used in Acts xix. 29, and 2 Cor. viii. 19.

II. I now proceed to observe their testimony to the scriptures.

1. Photius says they^k reject the holy prophets and all the Old Testament, and the ancient saints in general, calling them thieves and robbers.

2. 'As for the scriptures of the New Testament,' Photius says, 'they^l receive the gospel, and the apostle [meaning the gospels and the epistles of the apostle Paul at least,] which the Christian church receives and honours, and has delivered to them. These they receive without altering or corrupting them in any material things, as Valentinus and some others have done. But they pervert them from their true meaning to support their apostasy.'

3. Afterwards, having quoted 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16, and having applied to them what St. Peter says of some who wrested the

^b B. T. 2, p. 765. ^c Qui tametsi se a Manichæorum impuritibus alienos dicunt, sunt tamen dogmatum ipsorum vigilantissimi custodes et propugnatores. Pet. Sic. ap. Bib. P. P. Max. T. 16, p. 754, B.

^d Εν ταυτη γυνη τις ονοματι καλλινη—δυο τικτηι παιδας, —Εκ θατερον τοιουν των ερμενεων, οτη παυλος ηγομα—παυλιανων κλησιν οι της αποστασιας ερασαι μετελλαξαντο. Ph. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 2, p. 4, 5. Vid. et Petr. Sic. ib. p. 759, A.

^e Δυο μεν αρχας ομολογησιν, ως οι μαριχαιοι. Phot. ib. l. i. c. 6, in.

^f Και τοιγε τε διδασκαλη αυτων μανιτος, κ. λ. ib. c. 8, p. 24.

^g αι τε μανιτες

παραφουαδες. ib. l. 4. c. 1. in. et passim.

^h See p. 407.

ⁱ Της μεντοι παρ' αυτοις ιερων ταξιν επιχοιτας εκ ιερεις, αλλα συνεκοδημης και νοταριως επονομαζησι. l. i. c. 9, p. 31. Conf. c. 25, p. 134, et Wolf. not. in. loc.

^k Αλλα γαρ και της ιερης προφητας, και πασαν την παλαιαν γραφην, και της αλλης απογρεφονται αγιως, λητας και κλεπτας αποκαληντες. ib. l. i. c. 8, p. 23.

^l Το μεντοι ευαγγελιον, και τον αποστολον, α και το διον των χριστιανων περιτυσσεται και τιμα συνταγμα, εγγραφως τωτοις παρεθετο, τοις ρημασι μεν και εωμασιν υδεν μεγα παραλλαττω τε λογη το σχημα, κ. λ. l. 1, c. 3, p. 9. Vid. et p. 10, 11.

scriptures to their own destruction, he says: 'As ^m for the oracles of the Lord and the apostles, and the other scriptures, (by which last I mean the Acts of the apostles, and the epistles called catholic,) excepting those of the chief apostle, they receive them: for those ascribed to him they do not receive at all. And concerning the Acts of the apostles, and the catholic epistles, they are not all of the same opinion: for some reject them, whilst others join them with the other scriptures received by all.'

4. Photius does also elsewhere expressly say they ⁿ rejected Peter, because he denied his Lord and Master. Mr. Wolff therefore says, that ^o perhaps these are the only Christians that ever rejected both of St. Peter's epistles.

5. In another place, 'they ^p admit, as the rule of their faith, the oracles of the Lord, and the epistles of the great apostle Paul, and some of them the Acts of the apostles, and the catholic epistles, except those of the chief apostle.'

6. Again, 'they ^q endeavour to confirm their doctrines by the scriptures of the gospel, and the divine apostle Paul.'

7. He quotes to them ^r the divine Luke in the Acts, though, as he adds, many of the sect do not receive that book.

8. He quotes to them expressly ^s Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, or Jews, as his word is.

2. What regard the Paulicians had for the book of the Revelation I cannot particularly say; Photius not quoting ^u it in his argument with them.

10. I add one thing more. These ^t people greatly respected the

^m Οἱ αὐτὰ τε τὰ κυριακά λογία, καὶ τὰ ἀποτολικά, καὶ τὰς ἀλλὰς γραφάς, φημι δὴ τὰς τε πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τὰς καθολικὰς λεγόμενας, πλὴν τῶν ἀναφερομένων εἰς τὸν κορυφαῖον, ἐκείνας γὰρ ἡδὲ τοῖς ῥημασὶν παραδίδονται. — Καὶ τὰς πράξεις δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τὰς καθολικὰς ἡ πάντες αὐτῶν συναρμοῦσι τοῖς ἄλλοις, εἰσι δὲ οἱ καὶ συντάττουσι. Id. l. i. c. 8, p. 27.

ⁿ — μαλιστα δὲ τὸν κορυφαῖον τῶν ἀποστόλων πείρου δυσφημῶσιν, ἐτι γενομένην ἐξαρνῶν, φασί, τῆς εἰς τὸν διδάσκαλον καὶ χρίστον πίστεως. ib. c. 8, p. 24.

^o Hi igitur forte foli ex omni Christianorum antiquitate utramque Petri epistolam adversati sunt, cum Eusebius lib. iii. c. 3. H. E. testetur priorem ab omnibus, posteriorem ab antiquioribus non receptam fuisse. At hi quidem id fecerunt, oborta, an Petri ca sit, dubitatione; illi vero, ex temerario quodam in Petrum odio. Wolff. ib. p. 27.

^p ἐν οἷς τὰ τε κυριακά ἀναγιγρᾶται λογία,

καὶ τῇ μεγάλῃ ἀποτολῇ παυλῇ αἱ ἐπιστολαί, καὶ παρ' ἐμοῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ πράξεις, καὶ τῶν καθολικῶν ὅσαι παρὰ τὰς τῇ κορυφαίῃ τυγχάνουσιν. ib. l. i. c. 13, p. 56, 57.

^q οἷς τε τὰς εὐαγγελικὰς γραφὰς τιμᾶν ἰσχυρίζονται, καὶ οἷς τὸν ἀποστόλον καὶ θεοφόρον παῦλον τῇ οἰκίᾳ φρονήματος δογματικῇ καὶ διδασκαλῶν καταφύεσθαι. l. 4, c. 6, p. 133. ^r Ταῖς αὐτὰς πράξεσιν ὁ θεὸς ἠκούσας, καὶ καὶ τὸ πλεῖστον τῆς ἀποστασίας αὐτῶν τὰς ἐκείνῃ φωνᾷ ἡ προσκίπεται. l. 2, c. 6, p. 187.

^s Τῇ αὐτῇ γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ παῦλος πρὸς ἰουδαίους γραφὴν, τὴν πατρικὴν ἀρμόζει φωνή, καὶ λ. l. 2, c. x. p. 185. ^t Ἡ παραρημμένη μαχηαία γυνή, ἥκα το πρῶτον εἰς οὐλίαν αὐτῇ κατέστη, ἡ κατὰ, φησὶν, εἰπέ μοι, τὰ θεῖα καὶ ἀναγιγνωσκεις εὐαγγέλια; Ὁ δὲ — μὴ εἶναι φησας τῇ τῶν λαϊκῶν πλεονεξίᾳ τὰς ἀνδρῶν ὥτως τῇ τῶν φρικτῶν λογίῳ πεισθῆναι ἀναγιγνῶσιν, ἀνίσταται γὰρ τοῖς ἱεροῖς τοῖς ἱεροῖς. l. i. c. 20, p. 100.

scriptures of the New Testament, and approved that all people, the laity, and even women, should read, study, and understand them. This appears from a story told by Photius of a conversation between a Manichæan woman and Sergius, who afterwards became a zealous promoter of the sect.

11. I have almost entirely confined myself to Photius, not thinking it needful to be more particular at present, or to copy much from Peter, or any other author, concerning so late a sect. However I shall briefly observe, that Peter of Sicily in the main agrees with Photius, often saying that the Paulicians rejected the Old Testament, and used only the gospels and the apostle. In particular, he says: 'They receive the four gospels, and the fourteen epistles of Paul, and the catholic epistle of James, and the three epistles of John, and the catholic epistle of Jude, and the Acts of the apostles, without making any alterations in them. But they admit not the two epistles of the chief of the apostles.'

12. Upon the whole, the Paulicians, according to these accounts, received the books of the New Testament as they were received by other Christians, excepting the two epistles of Peter, which they entirely rejected, if these authors say right. But what was their sentiment concerning the Revelation we cannot say.

" Quod veteris instrumenti tabulas non admittant, prophetaſque planos et latrones appellent, — aut ſola duntaxat ſacra quatuor evangelia, et S. Pauli Apoſtoli denas quaternat epistoſas recipiant, Jacobi item Catholicam, ternas Joannis, Catho-

licam Judæ, cum Actis Apoſtolorum, iſtlem quibus apud nos ſunt verbis. — Binas Catholicas magni et immobilis eccleſiæ fundamenti, — principis apoſtolorum, non admittunt. Petr. ubi ſupr. p. 756, E.

R E M A R K S

U P O N

MR. BOWER'S ACCOUNT OF THE MANICHEES,
IN THE SECOND VOLUME OF HIS HISTORY OF THE POPES.

[FIRST PUBLISHED AT THE END OF VOL. IX.]

NONE of my learned friends, who have read Mr. Bower's History of the Popes, (and I suppose they have all read it,) could forbear observing the difference between his account of the Manichees, and that given in the sixth volume of the first edition of this work. And some of them have intimated that I could not decline taking public notice of it, unless I would be understood to allow that the account given by me of the same people was wrong; for which I see no reason. Indeed I cannot but wish that Mr. Bower had read that volume, or the late Mr. Beaufobre's History of the Manichees, from which I received a great deal of light; I think he would then have expressed himself very differently from what he has done: as it is, I think myself obliged to make a few remarks.

In the history of Manes, or Mani (as the Persians his country-men call him,) which is at the beginning of note (D) p. 19, 20, of Mr. Bower's second volume, there are, in my opinion, several mistakes: as may appear from the account given of Mani, and his works, and predecessors, in the forementioned volume: to which they are referred who are pleased to look into it.

In the latter part of the same note, p. 21, 22, Mr. Bower proceeds to the tenets of this sect, which I considered formerly, so far as I judged needful. I therefore take notice of a very few things only in Mr. Bower upon this article.

In that note, p. 21, says Mr. Bower: 'Thus was gluttony with them a cardinal virtue, and eating to excess highly meritorious.' I do not conceive how that can be truly said of the Manichees, when their elect, the most distinguished part of them, comprehending their ecclesiastics, and some others, were obliged to abstain from meat, and wine, and eggs, and fish. And Mr. Bower says, p. 23, that 'their auditors, as well as their elect, kept two fasts in the week, the one on Sunday, the other on Monday.' That the Manichees were great fasters was shewn p. 410, 411: that they were by principle, and frequent practice, a temperate, abstemious sort of people, appears, I think, from a passage which I have not yet alleged at all. It is near the conclusion of a work generally ascribed to Marius Victorinus Afer, in the fourth century; which is a letter to Justin, a Manichee, a learned man, and the author's friend. 'In a

^a Et cassum nunc usque jugi inedia, inimica, ut ais, carnis membra tenuasti, censens ipse animæ officere meritis, ac naturæ passi corporis succos, ac pinguedinis distentæ grassamina atque ipsorum abdomi-

num mole prægravari: si post hunc jejuniorem laborem ad creatorem tuum, quem ais, aut diabolum, aut exteriores tenebras reverteris. T. M. Victorin. adv. Manich. Ap. B. PP. Lugd. T. 4. p. 292, D. E.

'vain,' says he, 'do you now macerate your body, and mortify it with continual fasting and watching; if, after all, it has no other lot than to return to the devil, who, you say, is it's creator.'

But, undoubtedly, Mr. Bower has some reason for saying what he does; which therefore ought to be considered. 'The particles of the good nature were, according to them, in all beings of this universe, mixed with, and chained to, the particles of the evil nature. Such, however, as happened to be in the food which they used, were, in being used by them, delivered for ever from so painful a bondage. Thus was gluttony with them a cardinal virtue, and eating to excess highly meritorious:' p. 21, note (D). This therefore is only a consequence deduced from the just mentioned supposed principle of theirs. But it does not appear that they discerned this consequence; for, so far as we can find, they did not, by principle, eat to excess: but were, and upon principle, great fasters and very abstemious. Augustine imputes to them the same principle, whether justly or not I do not now inquire. Nevertheless he does not upon that account charge them with excess in eating; because I suppose he knew they were not guilty of it. But he ridicules their fasting: 'Your fasting,' says he, 'is cruel; you ought to be always eating; whilst you cease to eat, you forbear to deliver the particles of the good nature from their chains.'

Farther, p. 21: 'They rejected the Old Testament, and some parts of the New, especially the Acts of the apostles.' That the Manichees rejected the Old Testament is undoubted; whether they rejected any books of the New Testament, and particularly the Acts of the apostles, has been carefully examined p. 500—508.

In the latter part of that note, p. 23, Mr. Bower gives a shocking account of their eucharist, taken from ancient ecclesiastical writers. And afterwards, at p. 25, he tells the same, or like story from pope Leo, commonly called the great: this was also examined. See particularly my reference to Beausobre, with his arguments and observations, p. 408; in which, if I am not mistaken, there is a sufficient vindication of the Manichees from the charge of lewd and abominable rites and mysteries.

Nevertheless, as I did not then distinctly speak of Pope Leo, upon whom Mr. Bower chiefly insists, I shall now consider what is alleged from him. 'He spared no pains,' says Mr. B. p. 25, 'to find them out; and being informed by some, whom they had attempted to seduce, where they assembled, he caused great numbers of them to be seized, in virtue of the imperial edicts, and among the rest their bishop, and some of their teachers. Having them thus in his power, his first care was to learn of them their true tenets, and the secret practices of their sect; which he had no sooner done, than he assembled the neighbouring bishops, and those who happened to be then at Rome, with a great number of presbyters; inviting to the assembly even the laymen of any rank,

^b Nec ipsa jejunia vobis competunt. Non enim oportet vacare fornacem, in qua spiritale aurum de stercore commixtione purgatur, et a miserandis nexibus divina membra solvuntur. Quapropter ille est misericordior inter vos, qui se potuerit ita

exercere, ut nihil ejus valetudini obsit, sepe crudos cibos sumere, et multa consumere. Vos autem.... a membrorum divinorum purgatione cessando crudeliter jejunatis. Contr. Faust. l. 6, c. 4, T. 8.

§ the

'the great officers of the empire, and the senate. . . . Being all met, and in great expectation, Leo ordered the elect of the Manichæes, that is their teachers and chief men among them, to be brought forth. Great was their confusion when they appeared before so grand an assembly; but being encouraged by Leo, they first owned their impious tenets, and their superstitious practices, and discovered a crime, which modestly, says pope Leo, 'would not allow him to name: but it was so fully proved,' adds he 'that the most incredulous were thoroughly satisfied it was true, for all those who were concerned in that abominable act were present: viz. a girl of twelve years old, the two women who had brought her up, and prepared her for the crime, the youth who had debauched her, and the bishop who presided at that detestable ceremony, and had directed it. . . . It appeared from the confession which their bishop made openly, and gave in writing, that they committed these abominations chiefly on their festivals.' I think it may be worth our while to see pope Leo's own words; which therefore I transcribe below.

With regard then to pope Leo I would observe, first, that we have not remaining any copy of the proceedings against these people to which Leo refers. Secondly, though the confessions mentioned by Leo seem a specious argument for the truth of these charges, yet I apprehend that, when duly weighed, they are of little value. By menaces, and promises, and good management, an artful and powerful ecclesiastic, like Leo, is able to obtain such confessions as he wants, whenever there are any people, who have fallen under his displeasure, and he has determined to harass them with fines, or imprisonment, or banishment. Says Athenagoras, in his Apology for the Christians of his time, 'that our enemies may seem not to hate us without reason, they accuse us of abominable feasts, and incestuous mixtures in our assemblies.' It has been the way of all persecutors in general. They will make those appear criminal whom they intend to destroy, and will do their utmost to expose them to general scorn and aversion. Thirdly, after all these examinations and confessions, Leo did not know when this abominable rite, with which he charged them, was performed. First he says, 'in their worship: de sacris tamen eorum,' &c. then 'in their festivals: de festivitatum eorum consuetudine.' In

^c De sacris tamen eorum, quæ apud illos tam obscena sunt, quam nefanda, quod inquisitioni nostræ Dominus manifestare voluit non tacemus, ne quisquam putet nos de hac re dubiæ famæ et incertis opinionibus credidisse. Residentibus itaque mecum Episcopis et Presbyteris, ac in eundem confessionis Christianis viris ac nobilibus congregatis, Electos et Electas eorum iussimus præsentari. Qui cum et perversitate dogmatis sui, et de festivitatum suarum consuetudine multa referarent, illud quoque scelus, quod eloqui verendum est, prodiderunt: quod tanta diligentia investigatum est, ut nihil minus credulis, nihil obtræctoribus, relinqueretur ambiguum. Aderant enim omnes personæ, per quos infandum facinus fuerat per-

petratum, puerula scilicet ut multum decennis, et duæ mulieres quæ ipsam nutrierant, et huic sceleri præparaverant. Præsto erat etiam adolescentulus vitiator puellæ, et episcopus ipsorum detestandi criminis ordinator. Omnium par fuit horum et una confessio, et patefactum est execratum, quod aures nostræ vix ferre potuerunt. De quo ne apertius loquentes, castos offendamus auditus, gestorum documenta sufficiunt. . . . Leon. Serm. 15. c. 4, p. 64. edit. Lugd. 1700. Conf. Ep. 15, al. 93, c. 16, p. 230, 231. et Ep. 8. al. 2.

^d Ετι δὲ καὶ τροφῆς καὶ μαζῆς λογοποιήσαντες αὐτῆς καὶ ἡμῶν ἵνα τε μισοῦντο ἡμῶν μετὰ λόγῳ. κ. λ. Legat. pro. Chr. p. 34, D.

another place * it is 'in their mysteries.' Once more, 'in the principal feast of their sect.' If good evidence of this fact had been produced, he would have expressed himself more clearly and uniformly. As pope Leo says that this was done 'in the principal feast of their sect,' Beaufobre understood him to mean their Bema, an annual festival, celebrated in honour of Mani with great * solemnity. 'Which,' he says, 'affords a manifest proof of the falsehood of the deposition of the witnesses before Leo: for that feast was not profaned with any sacrifices of unchastity. Augustine, who, when a Manichee, was present at it, has described it, and discerned nothing impure in it.' Fourthly, it appears from pope Leo that the Manichees celebrated the eucharist in the like manner with other Christians: for he has informed us that 'the^h better to conceal themselves, and avoid the sufferings which by law they were exposed to, they would come to church and communicate with the catholics; when they partook of the bread, but refused the cup.' The reason is manifest: according to the Manichæan rule, the elect, who alone had a right to communicate at the Lord's table, were forbidden wine, which was used by the catholics. If, instead of wine, water had been proposed to them, or some other liquor not prohibited, they would have received it. I think that what Leo says teaches us two things. The first of which is, that the Manichees observed the eucharist in the same manner with the catholics, except that they used some other liquor instead of wine. And certainly the testimony of Leo in this point is very remarkable. The other thing which we learn from hence is, that the Manichees were scrupulous and conscientious men. Who can believe that they, who refused to taste wine, though it were to secure themselves from heavy sufferings, admitted into their religious rites abominable filthiness, which no reasonable creature can bear to think of? Fifthly, the Manichees at Rome, in the time of pope Leo, were a sober and modest people. For he found himself obliged frequently to caution his own people and hearers against beingⁱ seduced 'by their fastings, abstinence from certain meats, mean dress, pale countenances,' and other marks of a sober and abstemious course of life. Which is agreeable to Augustine, who says, that 'by^k an appearance of chastity and temperance they ensnared many people.' Sixthly, pope Leo's abusive manner of speaking of the Manichees invalidates all his accusations

* In execrabilibus autem mysteriis eorum. Ep. 15, al. 23, c. 16, p. 230.

^f — in ipso præcipuo observantia sue festo, sicut proxima confessione patefactum est, ut animi, ita et corporis pollutione letantur. Sermon. 23, c. 4, p. 76, al. Sermon. 4, De Nativitate Domini.

^g Hist. de Manich. T. 2, p. 754.

* A brief account of that festival may be seen p. 379, and 492.

^h Cumque ad legendam infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum, ne penitus latere non possint, ore indigno Christi corpus accipiant, sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Sermon. 41, c. 5,

p. 106. al. De Quadragesima. iv.

ⁱ Neminem fallant discretionibus ciborum, sordibus vestium, vultuumque palloribus. Non sunt casta jejunia, quæ non de ratione veniunt continentia, sed de arte fallacia. Sermon. 33, c. v. p. 93.

Non vos seducant deceptoris artibus ficta et simulata jejunia, quæ non ad purificationem proficiunt animarum. Speciem quidem sibi pietatis et castitatis assumunt, sed hoc dolo actuum suorum obsecna circumtegunt. &c. Sermon. 23, c. 6, p. 76.

^k Duæ maxime sunt illecebræ Manichæorum, quibus decipiuntur incauti — altera, cum vitæ castæ, et memorabilis continentia, imaginem præferant. De Mor. Cath. Eccl. 1, c. 1, T. 1.

against them. For he says, 'they¹ were the worst of all heretics, who had nothing in them that was tolerable: whose law is a lie, whose religion is the devil, and whose sacrifice is filthiness, and the like.' Is any regard to be had to a man who talks at that rate? He who should take his notion of the Manichæan worship from pope Leo, I believe, would suffer himself to be grossly imposed upon. It might be better to take it from Faustus, one of their own bishops, as cited in †† Augustine, and also in this volume at p. 489.

I must now return to the note before cited at p. 23. 'The great and chief mystery of their sect was the eucharist. And it was in celebrating the eucharist that they committed the abominations with which the fathers have reproached them. We might indeed suspect the testimony of the fathers, it being well known that in declaiming against heretics they are apt to exaggerate, and did not always scrupulously adhere to truth. But that the Manichees abandoned themselves, in the celebration of their eucharist, to the most impure and infamous practices, is not only attested by them, but has been often proved by unexceptionable witnesses, nay and owned by themselves, before the civil magistrates, in Italy, in Gaul, in Paphlagonia, and Africa.'

But is not that a new charge? Is not this different from what we have been considering? 'The Manichees abandoned themselves, in the celebration of the eucharist, to the most impure and infamous practices.' Those expressions seem to me to imply promiscuous lewdness, or the general practice of impurity at their eucharist. But pope Leo, as we have seen, speaks only of 'one girl debauched by a youth,' for a certain purpose. And in a like manner August de Hær. cap. 46. T. 8.

But Mr. Bower has some other evidence beside that of the fathers, and says 'it has been proved by unexceptionable witnesses, and has been owned by themselves.' I suppose Mr. B. may have an eye to a passage in Augustine, which is to this purpose: 'It^m is said that some of them have confessed it before magistrates, not only in Paphlagonia, but likewise in Gaul. This I heard at Rome from a catholic Christian.' Upon which I would observe, first, that Augustine does not there speak of 'the Manichees abandoning themselves to impure practices,' but of a particular fact, like to that mentioned by Leo. Secondly, Mr. B.'s expressions are too strong and positive. Augustine only says that he had heard such a thing from a catholic at Rome. Thirdly, this fact, or these facts are laid at remote places. If Augustine had had proofs of them at home, or near at hand, he needed not to have gone so far as Paphlagonia and Gaul in quest of them. Fourthly, Mr. B. speaks of it's being 'proved and owned by themselves before civil magistrates in Italy and

¹ — quibus plenissime docetur, nullam in hac secta pudicitiam, nullam honestatem, nullam penitus reperiri castitatem: in qua lex est mendacium, diabolus religio, sacrificium turpitudine. Serm. 25. c. 4, p. 64.

Alie hæreses, dilectissimi, licet merito omnes in sua perversitate damnandæ sint, habent tamen singulæ in aliqua sui parte quod verum est. — In Manichæorum

autem scelestissimo dogmate prorsus nihil est, quod ex ulla parte possit tolerabile judicari. Serm. 23. c. 5, p. 76. al. De Nativitate Domini. iv.

†† Contr. Faust. l. 20, c. 3. T. 8.

^m Hoc se facere quidam confessi esse in publico judicio perhibentur, non tantum in Paphlagonia, sed etiam in Gallia, sicut a quodam Romæ Christiano catholico auctori. De Natura Boni. c. 47. T. 8.

'Africa.' Which I do not see in Augustine, but only Gaul and Paphlagonia; unless some other passage be also referred to.

Mr. B. concludes the note, upon which I have made these animadversions, saying: 'The Waldenses, who sprung up in the twelfth century, were stigmatized by their enemies with the odious name of Manichees. But that their doctrine was different from that of the Manichees, nay that it was altogether orthodox, I will shew in a more proper place.'

When Mr. B. comes to that part of his work, I suppose he will have the task of shewing, not only that the Waldenses were unjustly stigmatized with the Manichæan doctrine, but likewise, that they were not guilty of the impure and infamous practices generally imputed to the Manichees. And perhaps he may also discern at length, that those crimes were unjustly charged upon the real Manichees, or such as owned themselves disciples of Mani. But however that may be, I have taken the liberty to make these remarks for supporting what I had said formerly, and which I still think to be right: not with a design to detract from the merit of Mr. Bower's laborious and useful work, which I heartily wish he may carry on with continued and increasing acceptance and esteem.



THE END OF THE THIRD VOLUME.